MAY 1967

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 19

1

Two articles on

CHINA'S CULTURAL REVOLUTION

- THE EDITORS
- E. L. WHEELWRIGHT

The Omegna Prize

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME NINETEEN NUMBER ONE MAY 1967

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Understanding the Cultural Revolution 1
THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA by E. L. Wheelwright 17
THE LESSON OF INDONESIA by *Donald Barnett* 34
THE OMEGNA PRIZE: Statements by Mayor Angelo Boldini 36
Leo Huberman 38
Paul M. Sweezy 42
The Judges 47
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 48
CORRESPONDENCE:
A SHAMEFUL THING by Rick Rhoads 54
LAPSE OF TASTE by Stephen D. Jacoby 56
WHERE WE STAND by The Editors 58

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright © 1967, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: USA: 116 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Europe: Frances Kelly, 9 King Edward Mansions, 629 Fulham Road, London, S.W.6., Telephone: Renown 8824.
Latin America: Editorial MR, Casilla 5437, Santiago, Chile.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $10; elsewhere $12.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.
GENERAL MANAGER: Edward Boorstein

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

With this issue, MONTHLY REVIEW begins its nineteenth year—pretty old for a radical periodical in the United States, or anywhere else for that matter. On page 58 we reprint "Where We Stand" from the first issue (May, 1949). It got crowded out last year and the year before, so subscribers who came in during the last three years have never seen it. We wouldn't write it in exactly the same terms if we were starting the magazine this month: in particular, more emphasis would have to be placed on China and Cuba and the developing revolutions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Still there is nothing in the statement which we would want to take back, and we are glad to remind our readers of the thoughts which underlay the founding of the magazine, with its initial circulation of 400, eighteen years ago.

Leo Huberman's books are widely sold and read in Japanese translations, and he receives many heart-warming letters from Japanese readers. Two recent letters are especially worth quoting. One from a high-school boy in Yokohama says: "I wish I had been born fifteen years before, so I could have read your books fifteen years before." And the other from

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNDERSTANDING THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

It is pretty generally agreed by now that the Cultural Revolution in China is an event of world-shaking import. And yet much of what is being said and written about it, at least in the sources to which we have access, is uninspired and uninspiring. Endless accumulation of details yields little useful or usable knowledge; steady proliferation of hypotheses contributes more to confusion than to understanding. Why?

There are doubtless many reasons, but perhaps the most important is that most commentators on the Cultural Revolution interpret it in terms of some experience which is familiar to them. Not that this procedure is necessarily bad: if the kind of upheaval which is now taking place in China had already occurred elsewhere, the method could certainly be fruitful. But if, as we believe, the Cultural Revolution is something genuinely new in history, interpreting it according to criteria borrowed from some past experience can only lead to muddle and confusion.

Most prone to fall into this trap, for obvious reasons, are those whose attentions and emotions have long been fixated on the Soviet Union. For them, Soviet experience provides ready-made models and norms for interpreting all subsequent revolutionary developments, including what is now happening in China.

Thus partisans of those now in power in the Soviet Union, for whom the ruling Communist Party is by definition the repository of all revolutionary wisdom and virtue, are bound to see in the Cultural Revolution a nihilistic and ultimately disastrous attack on the very essence of the socialist revolution itself. In their eyes no progress is possible save through what they regard as the tried and true methods developed during a half century of Soviet experience.

A similar obsession with Soviet experience is shown by the Trotskyists who see in present Chinese developments a re-enact-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment in a different setting of the Stalinist conflicts and purges of the 1920's and 1930's. Mao Tse-tung, in this view, heads one segment of the "bureaucracy" which is struggling for predominance against other segments. Whoever wins, the result can only be the continuation of "bureaucratic rule"—unless by some miracle there is a return to a golden age of "proletarian democracy" such as is supposed to have prevailed in the Soviet Union under Lenin and Trotsky.

Unfortunately for all these "explanations," China is not Russia; Mao is not Stalin; no Communist Party is or ever was infallible; and the years 1917-1924 in the Soviet Union were characterized by civil war and chaos and revolutionary dictatorship. No clear thinking about the Cultural Revolution is possible unless we are prepared at the outset to try to see the situation in China today as it really is and as it has developed out of centuries of Chinese history and decades of Chinese revolutionary experience. This is of course not easy, far from it; and with essential facts as hard to come by as they are under present circumstances, even the best informed and most perceptive analyst is certain to overlook significant happenings, make mistakes, see some things in wrong perspective. But difficulties provide no excuse for not trying.

What one needs above all in seeking to understand such a huge and complicated event as the Cultural Revolution is what may perhaps be called historical imagination. No one, not even the most favorably situated individual, can have personal knowledge of more than a very small fraction of what goes on in a country the size of China, and even knowledge acquired at second hand is limited. If nevertheless it is possible to have a conception, and a vivid conception at that, of the whole rapidly changing scene, the reason is obviously the enormous creative power of the imagination, that faculty which, according to Karl Marx, differentiates human beings from the rest of the animal world.* Whether the imagination does its work well or badly

* "A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality." *Capital* (Kerr ed.), Vol. 1, p. 198.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depends partly on its natural power (for it seems that people are very differently endowed), partly on the training to which it has been subjected, and partly on the appropriateness of the materials with which it works. And it is with respect to this last that an eager receptivity to the new, the unexpected, the significant, the illuminating, must be zealously maintained and cultivated.

It is in this connection that we would like to direct the reader's attention to certain pieces of "evidence," partly speculative and partly factual, which seem to us to be most helpful in clarifying the true nature of the Cultural Revolution.

The first involves a comparison of China with the Soviet Union—not, however, of what is now happening in China with what actually happened in the Soviet Union but with what might have happened if Lenin had lived as long as Mao Tse-tung has lived. For it is surely obvious that in any comparative study of the two revolutions, Mao's role must be likened to that of Lenin, certainly not to that of Stalin. Mao was born in 1893 and will therefore be 74 years old this year. Lenin died in 1924 at the age of 54. If he had lived as long as Mao, he would have survived at least into the middle 1940's, and most likely there would never have been a Stalin era. Nor, probably, would there ever have been such a thing as Trotskyism: the most natural assumption is that Lenin would have remained the unchallenged leader of the Soviet state and that the relationship between him and Trotsky would have continued to be what it was from 1917 to 1923. How would Lenin have handled the great problems which faced the Soviet Union in the later 1920's and the 1930's?

Obviously no one knows for sure, and on many subjects there are not enough clues to justify even a highly speculative answer. But this is not so with respect to the problem which is our chief present concern. For we know that during the last two or three years of his life, Lenin became increasingly worried about the kind of regime which was emerging in the Soviet Union. To quote E. H. Carr, a leading historian of the Bolshevik Revolution:

> On November 20, 1922, he had made the last public speech

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his life to the Moscow Soviet. Shortly afterwards he had his last conversation with Trotsky—a conversation to which Trotsky in retrospect attached much importance. . . . Lenin expressed his horror and fear of the growth of bureaucracy in the Soviet apparatus. Trotsky retorted that bureaucracy was to be found not only in state, but in party institutions; and Lenin half-jestingly proposed "a bloc against bureaucracy in general and against the Orgbureau in particular."*

The problem was neither new nor one which no previous attempts had been made to solve. In 1919 a Commissariat of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate (Rabkrin) was created to combat bureaucracy and corruption in the state apparatus; and in 1921 a Central Control Commission was set up within the Communist Party to perform a similar function with respect to the party apparatus. The methods adopted by the Control Commission were specially characteristic of Lenin's approach. Local control commissions held public meetings open to Communists and non-Communists alike, at which the conduct of all members of the Party, from highest to lowest, was submitted to searching examination. Those found guilty of misdeeds could be rebuked or, in extreme cases, expelled from the Party. The idea was that the people should have the power not to accept or reject the dictatorship of the Party as such but to control the behavior of the particular people who ruled in the name of the Party.

In the circumstances of civil war and chaos which existed at the time, neither Rabkrin nor the Control Commission was effective. In the last article he ever wrote, Lenin felt obliged to denounce Rabkrin in the strongest terms; and in later years the Control Commission was turned into the opposite of an organ of popular control and became instead an instrument of the Stalinist purges. Summing up Lenin's final position, Carr writes:

If Lenin was driven by practical necessities to recognize a constantly growing concentration of authority, there is no evidence that he wavered in his belief in the antidote of "direct democracy." But he began to understand that progress would be slower than he

* *A History of Soviet Russia: The Interregnum, 1923-1924*, p. 257. See also Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921-1929*, Chapter 1 ("The Power and the Dream").

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had at first hoped and the bogey of bureaucracy more difficult to conjure.*

In the light of this record, are we not entitled to assume that if Lenin had lived, he would have been continuously, and indeed increasingly, concerned with the struggle against bureaucracy, corruption, and privilege, especially inside the Party? And when the problem proved to be as persistent and intractable as we now know it to be, is there any reason to doubt that he would have been drawn to increasingly radical experiments in "direct democracy" to find a viable solution?

Precisely what form these experiments might have taken we cannot know. But there is nothing in the least far-fetched or implausible in assuming that they would have climaxed in something very like the Cultural Revolution. For according to all available evidence, the overriding purpose of the Cultural Revolution is to free the Communist Party of China from the influence of those who "are taking the capitalist road," which we take to be a Chinese way of saying those who use their positions of authority to accumulate special privileges and to lord it over rather than serve the people. It is certainly no part of the purpose of the Cultural Revolution to undermine, let alone abolish, the Party's monopoly of power, any more than that was the purpose of Rabkrin and the Central Control Commission in Lenin's day. In present-day China, as in early revolutionary Russia, the aim is to purify the Party, to rid it of evil inheritances from the feudal and capitalist past, to enable it to perform more effectively its role as leader and guide along the road to socialism and communism. And the means chosen—especially the mobilization of the younger generation which has received its education since the Revolution, and the formation of Paris Commune-type "cultural revolutionary groups, committees and congresses" in localities and places of work—seem to be eminently appropriate and in full accord with Lenin's ideas of "direct democracy." The truth would seem to be that Mao's Cultural Revolution is the purest kind of Leninism. For if Lenin had remained in power twenty years longer, is it not likely that he would have

* *A History of Soviet Russia: The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923*, Volume 1, p. 224.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seen the problem in much the same way Mao has seen it? After all, real revolutionaries—and Lenin and Mao are unquestionably two of the greatest revolutionaries of all time—do tend to think alike.

The second bit of "evidence" we want to call attention to comes from that segment of China's revolutionary history which is so brilliantly analyzed by William Hinton in *Fanshen*. The village of Long Bow which is the locus of Hinton's story was liberated in August, 1945, and immediately came under a new village government of revolutionary cadres and militiamen. Less than two years later, the new regime had disastrously deteriorated. It was no longer possible to ignore

> what had become increasingly obvious for a long time—that the revolutionary cadres and militiamen of Long Bow were gradually alienating themselves from the people by arbitrary orders, indiscriminate beatings, the assumption of special privileges, and "rascal behavior." Nor was Long Bow the only community in the district where a relatively small number of active young men had "mounted the horse," as the peasants so aptly put it, and were riding around to suit their own fancy. By the same token the Fifth District was not the only district where such things were occurring in Lucheng County, nor was Lucheng County itself an exception among the counties of the Taihang Region. In the spring of 1947, the government and the Party organization of the Taihang region took note of the critical situation and launched a "Wash Your Face" campaign designed to put a stop to all such tendencies, and to overcome the opportunist and hedonist attitudes that fostered them.
>
> The method adopted in this campaign was to set up a *gate* or council of delegates, elected by the peasants at large, before which all the cadres had to answer for their motives and their actions. The phrase "Wash Your Face" came from Chairman Mao himself who had many times explained that the thoughts of revolutionary leaders inevitably became spotted and stained by the corrupt habits of the past and the rotten social environment that surrounded them on every side, just as their faces became spotted and stained by the dust and dirt of the natural environment. These spots and stains had to be washed off frequently just as people daily washed their faces to make them clean again. And just as one could not see the dirt on one's own face without consulting a mirror, so one could not clearly see one's own bad thinking and bad behavior without consulting the people who suffered as a consequence of both and could therefore reflect a truer image. (*Fanshen,* pp. 238-239.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here we have in embryo the whole idea of the Cultural Revolution—a gigantic, nation-wide "Wash Your Face" campaign.

To launch such a campaign, however, is one thing, and to carry it through successfully is quite another. Hinton's account of what happened in Long Bow, both in 1947 and later, throws valuable light on both aspects of the problem.

In the first place, the 1947 campaign was a failure. When the cadres were subjected to public examination, all sorts of grievances and criticisms were advanced, some constructive and some designed to secure the downfall and dismissal of the guilty ones—and all were guilty in one degree or another. A little reflection will show, however, that getting rid of those who had misbehaved could not provide any solution. For one thing, it left open the question as to who would replace them; and for another, even if satisfactory replacements could be found, there was no guarantee that they would not succumb to the temptations of power as their predecessors had done. What was needed was to *reform* the cadres, not to liquidate them. And this those responsible for the 1947 campaign in Long Bow were unable to accomplish. As Hinton explains it:

> Instead of allowing this storm of criticism to rage and using it to educate the peasants to distinguish honest from dishonest opinions so that the cadres could reform and all the people profit from a living political lesson, the district leaders lost their nerve and retreated. They intervened on behalf of the cadres and in effect suppressed criticism, both honest and dishonest. As a result, although some cadres, getting a scent of things to come, changed their outlook to a certain extent and corrected some of their faults, others . . . only became more arrogant than before and retaliated against those who had dared to criticize them. Clearly something more drastic was needed if the tendencies which were already alienating the leaders from the people and undermining not only the village administration and the Peasants' Association, but the Communist Party branch as well were not seriously to undermine and compromise the Revolution. (*Fanshen,* p. 239.)

This paragraph occurs less than a page before the end of Part II of Hinton's book, and it is no exaggeration to say that a large proportion of the remaining five parts, constituting nearly two thirds of the whole, is devoted to describing and analyzing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fascinatingly intricate process, reaching its climax in the spring and early summer of 1948, by which the situation in Long Bow was radically transformed for the better—for the people, for the leaders, and for their mutual relations. There can be no question of providing even the barest summary here: the process simply does not lend itself to summarization. Suffice it to say that the experience of Long Bow shows how, in the Chinese style of work, practice enriches thought and thought guides action; how there can be purification without purges and progress without victims. It is a very reassuring and encouraging story Hinton tells about Long Bow. And if, as one can hardly help assuming, similar things are now happening on a large scale all over China, then one can feel reassured and encouraged about the outcome of the Cultural Revolution too.

Our final bit of "evidence" comes from an unexpected source—a professor at a leading United States business school. Barry M. Richman is Chairman of the International Business Program and of the Management Theory and Industrial Relations Divisions at the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles. He is also the author of well-regarded works on the industrial management systems of the Soviet Union and India. With this background it was quite natural that he should want to study the Chinese system, and since he has the good fortune to be a Canadian it was possible for him to make the necessary arrangements. In his own words:

> With my Canadian citizenship and letters of introduction from a number of leading Canadian educators and businessmen, the Chinese were quite willing to issue me a visa, and this enabled me to undertake my first-hand study of industry and management. I visited [in April-June, 1966] 11 major cities and surveyed 38 enterprises (factories) in a wide range of industries as well as 3 of the country's largest retail department stores. In addition to interviewing and observing managers, workers, Communist Party cadres, and trade union officials at work, I also met many key personnel at various central, provincial, and municipal-level planning, industrial, and commercial organizations.*

* Barry M. Richman, "Capitalists and Managers in Communist China," *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 1967, p. 58. A fuller account of the author's findings is scheduled for early publication by Ran-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Precisely because of his capitalist-business background and point of view, Richman's report throws an extraordinarily revealing light on the kind of society which is being constructed in China. And his frequent contrasts between Chinese and Soviet practices keep reminding us that there is a very different road the Chinese might be travelling. His topic is not the Cultural Revolution—it was still in its earliest stage when he left China—but as one reads his report the thought continually recurs that he is, whether he knows it or not, dealing with the most fundamental issue at stake in the Cultural Revolution: Will China stick it out on the revolutionary road Mao has charted for her, or will she succumb to what must be enormous pressures, both internal and external, to return to an essentially bourgeois conception of economy and society? As Richman himself recognizes, the future of mankind will be profoundly influenced by the answer.

Let us summarize some of Richman's major findings.

(1) First and perhaps foremost, the Chinese have abandoned the bourgeois conception of the factory as a highly rationalized production unit. Richman's remarks on this crucially important subject are very striking:

> The Chinese do not seem nearly as concerned as the Soviets about economic inefficiency at the factory level resulting from state planning and resource allocation problems. For the Chinese enterprise is not viewed as a purely economic unit where economic performance clearly takes priority. In fact, Chinese factories seem to pursue objectives pertaining to politics, education, and welfare as well as economic results. Moreover, in their overpopulated country, with very low wages, the regime is not very concerned about underemployment or disguised unemployment which lowers per capita productivity at various factories.
>
> The Chinese factory is a place where much political indoctrination occurs both at the individual and at the group level, with the aim of developing the pure Communist man as conceived by Mao. It is a place where illiterate workers learn how to read and write, and where employees can and do improve their work skills and develop new ones through education and training. It is a place where housing, schools, recreational facilities, roads, shops, and offices are often constructed or remodeled by factory

dom House under the title *Management, Industry and Ideology in Communist China.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employees. It is also a place from which employees go out into the fields and help the peasants with their harvesting.

Hence, if supplies do not arrive according to the plan, Chinese factory workers generally do not remain idle or unproductive—at least, by the regime's standards. In factories I visited where this type of situation arose, workers undertook some education or training during the period of delay in order to improve their skills; or they studied and discussed Chairman Mao's work; or, as was the case at the Tientsin Shoe and Wuhan Diesel Engine factories, they undertook various construction and modernization activities; or they worked on developing new or improved processes and products.

This type of activity makes more sense than meets the eye in a country where illiteracy has been widespread, the level of industrial skill generally low, and factory housing and other welfare facilities sparse and inadequate. The benefits of political indoctrination seem more questionable, but even this activity seems to have a favorable motivating impact which is difficult for the capitalistic Western mind to grasp fully. (pp. 61-62)

Richman does not realize it but what he is describing here is the replacement of narrow bourgeois, balance-sheet rationality by a comprehensive socialist rationality. If he did realize it, he would not be able to assume so glibly that the Chinese conception of the role of the factory makes sense only for an underdeveloped country. On the contrary, it is only through developing and extending this kind of socialist rationality that the advanced industrial countries can hope to overcome the dreadful social diseases—poverty in the midst of plenty, confusion of wants and needs, proliferation of high IQ idiots, urban blight, alienation, mass neuroses, and all the rest—which capitalism has visited upon them. All praise to the Chinese revolutionaries who are pioneering the road we must all travel if we are to survive as human beings!

In the meantime, it should be noted that the further the Chinese depart from bourgeois conceptions of rationality, the more impossible and meaningless will become quantitative comparisons between their and other countries' levels of income, productivity, etc. The Chinese are on the way to demonstrating in practice how all these seemingly hard statistical facts are in reality nothing but elaborate bourgeois rationalizations.

(2) In economic matters the Chinese practice flexibility and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a relatively high degree of decentralization, and their method of getting good results puts major emphasis on having people with the appropriate understanding and motivation in decision-making positions.

The reason that flexibility in planning does not get completely out of hand in China is that this country has a higher degree of decentralization of authority than does Russia. This means that administrators closer to the operating level have the authority to take more timely action in light of changing conditions. . . .

The Red Chinese leaders have always been anti-bureaucracy in attitude, since they feel that bureaucracy impedes the right interpretation of national and party policy because of vested interests, localism, and routinization. . . .

Since local party cadres have been viewed as generally dependable, the regime has not established a cumbersome system of checks, controls, and super-controls similar to that in the Soviet Union. . . .

A prominent official of the Chinese State Planning Commission whom I interviewed declared that in the 1950's Peking went too far in imitating the Soviet system of bureaucracy and control. He said that this proved highly ineffective. . . . He also pointed out that in China more stress is placed on education and on controlling individuals in key positions than on controlling the performance of the organization. (pp. 62, 63)

In the light of this, certain other aspects of Chinese policy become easier to understand. For a decentralized socialist system—i.e. one which is not controlled by the impersonal forces of the market—to work smoothly, it is essential that those who make the important decisions should think alike on fundamental problems of economy, society, and morality. This consideration alone is enough to explain why the dissemination, study, and acceptance of "Chairman Mao's thoughts" plays such an important role in the Chinese system: it is not a matter of glorifying an individual but of securing general agreement on what is right and important. Further, the policy of placing primary reliance on people rather than on organizations goes far to explain the particular form and function of the rectification campaigns which have been a recurring feature of Chinese revolutionary development and of which the Cultural Revolution is the biggest and most ambitious to date.

(3) The building of socialism requires the increasing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

separation of work from material rewards. And this is indeed Chinese policy and practice.

While the Soviet regime has accepted monetary incentives and self-interest as key motivating forces for both managers and workers, the Chinese regime takes a less sanguine view toward such rewards. . . .

I found during my visits to 38 Chinese factories that piece-rate incentives for workers had been completely abolished. However, at about 80 percent of the factories workers could still earn monthly or quarterly bonuses. And, interestingly enough, such bonuses were not based solely upon productivity; politics and helping co-workers were also key criteria. . . .

During the past few years, directors, vice directors, and party secretaries have not been eligible to receive bonuses at any enterprises. . . . (pp. 64-65)

Richman's reaction to this strange state of affairs is what we might expect from a business school professor:

Can top-level enterprise managers (or middle managers, too, for that matter) be adequately motivated over time to perform efficiently without bonuses? I doubt it. At present there seems to be considerable dedication, zeal, patriotism, and other non-material stimuli motivating many of them to do the best job they can. But these stimuli cannot do the job alone for long. Complicating the difficulty is the fact that salaries, powers, and living conditions of top managers are relatively low in relation to those of their subordinates. (p. 65)

The "difficulty," it seems, is not so much with the Chinese system as with the bourgeois conception of "human nature." But Richman believes that this is a purely temporary state of affairs: in the long run "human nature" will triumph. All the same, he finds the problem worrisome and he keeps coming back to it.

(4) As indicated in the last paragraph quoted, there is a high degree of equality in Chinese salary scales: "At most factories the ratio between directors' incomes and the average factory pay was less than 2 to 1; the highest ratio I found was about 3 to 1." (p. 65) But this equalitarianism goes beyond money incomes and reaches into all aspects of life.

In a Soviet or an American industrial enterprise there are generally clues which enable an outsider to distinguish the top

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

managers from the workers, and perhaps even the top managers from the lower-level managers. During my visits to Russian enterprises a few years ago, observable differences in the salary and wage scales, working and living conditions, dress, appearance, education, work patterns, and even interpersonal contacts gave me adequate clues to guess who was who. But in Chinese enterprises there are fewer clues than in probably any other country in the world.

In order for a Western [read: bourgeois] mind to make sense out of some of the more surprising and strange things going on in Chinese factories, one must be aware of two pure Communistic ideological tenets which the regime takes seriously and has gone a long way in implementing; (1) the abolition of classes, class distinctions, and elites; and (2) the abolition of distinctions between mental and physical labor. . . .

At Chinese enterprises there . . . seem to be no really very substantial differences in the housing conditions of managers, technicians, Reds, or workers. At the Nanking Chemical Fertilizer, Wuhan Iron and Steel Corporation, and Peking Cotton Textile No. 3 enterprises I spent quite a bit of time inspecting the factory housing. Top managers, lower-level managers, engineers, technicians, party cadres, and workers are all integrated in the apartment houses, for which a nominal monthly rent—typically 1 to 4 yuan [40¢ to $1.60] per room—is paid. . . .

All personnel eat together in the same canteen during working hours. Even though the larger factories have cars (some of them old U.S. models), top managers, key experts, and party officials claim that they walk, ride bikes, or take the bus to work. I was told that cars are only for official use or emergencies, and are used by all personnel. One can tell usually very little from dress or personal appearances in Chinese enterprises. Most personnel at all levels generally wear the conventional blue suits with caps—even the women. (pp. 65, 67)

All of which prompts the author to ask again: "In the absence of income and living standard differences, what does motivate the directors, party officials, and experts to perform well and to improve their performance at Chinese enterprises?" And he answers: "Dedication, loyalty, identification with the country's goals and progress, a deep sense of commitment and purpose—all these must play significant roles, particularly for the Reds and possibly for many of the experts." (p. 67) Again he assures us, however, that it can't last:

It seems to me that in the long run material gain and self-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest will have to play significant roles in motivating the Chinese experts, and perhaps even the Reds, unless the regime can actually mold a nation of pure Communist men. The Russians have tried that, failed, and seem to have given up the attempt. The Chinese are much more persistent, but centuries of world history and experience are clearly against them. (p. 68)

It is true that the Russians tried a policy of equalitarianism—but only for a very short time under Lenin and in extremely unfavorable conditions. After Stalin had consolidated his power, he deliberately reversed this policy and it has never been tried since. Russian experience therefore has little to teach in this respect. And as for the lessons of "centuries of world history and experience," only a bourgeois professor can be so certain that they prove the universal validity of the laws of the capitalist jungle.

(5) Workers play a considerable and increasing role in choosing and controlling their own managers, and the effects are generally positive. Elections and worker participation, says Richman, "give the workers a sense of identification, loyalty, belonging, and commitment to their enterprises. They also keep managers on their toes, since they must at least listen to the workers. . . . Perhaps more important to the regime is that worker participation results in a form of bottom-up control not only over economic performance, but also over the proper interpretation of state policy and ideologically correct behavior." (p. 68) Here again we see that tendency, commented upon earlier, for a strictly economic rationality to give way to a more comprehensive socialist rationality.

(6) The same tendency is observable in the policy of requiring managers to engage in manual labor. At first Richman could hardly believe what he saw:

> During my first visit to a Chinese factory, Peking Wool, I thought it was a joke or strange aberration when, during lunch in the cafeteria, I was introduced to the director who was cooking dumplings in the kitchen. He was doing one of his two days a week of physical labor. I soon learned that all enterprise directors, vice directors, party secretaries, and trade union leaders spend from one to two days each week in physical labor. . . . (p. 69)

And the effects? They seem to be favorable in creating "a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

type of cohesive team spirit" and in enabling "managers to observe and keep in close touch with concrete operating conditions and problems in their enterprises." But again the doubts: "But where experts—in a country that has a critical shortage of experts—are forced to spend as much as two days each week in physical labor, may not the disadvantages outweigh the advantages, especially in terms of economic performance?" (p. 69)

The answer probably is that it is hard to tell, but that in any case building socialism is more important than economic performance—at least for real socialists.

(7) The Chinese system works pretty well. In general, and not surprisingly, Richman finds that the performance of Chinese factories is inferior to that of Soviet factories, much inferior to that of American factories, but well above that of Indian factories. What is particularly significant from our point of view is that China's achievements have been due more to human and social than to scientific or technological factors:

> Thus far Red China has achieved substantial industrial progress, more because of managerial motivation and attitudes than because of managerial or technical know-how. . . .
>
> Chinese industry has also made significant progress because of the motivation, dedication, resourcefulness, hard work, and other attitudes of its labor force. Here greater credit must be given to the Reds than to the experts or managers. The Communist Party has organized and motivated workers on a national scale to identify with and strive for national economic progress and power. Hence enterprise management has much of its job of motivating personnel done at the outset. (p. 70)

Economic policy has been both to build up heavy industry and to increase the quantity and variety of consumer goods. On the latter point, Richman observes:

> There is a surprisingly wide variety of consumer goods of relatively good quality in the stores, even in areas which are seldom frequented by foreigners, such as Wusih and Loyang. The largest Soviet department store—GUM in Moscow—does not come close to the large department stores in Peking, Shanghai, or Tientsin in terms of variety or quality of consumer goods available. For example, Shanghai's General Department Store No. 1 carries more than 50,000 different types of products. (p. 72)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a final evaluation of China's industrial development, Richman states: "In spite of numerous managerial and technical problems at many of the Chinese enterprises, I am impressed by the wide range of goods that Chinese industry is capable of producing. China seems to be able to produce nearly anything it wants, but often it must produce very inefficiently and at a tremendous cost." (pp. 77-78)

In his concluding remarks, Richman returns to the question whether what seems to him to be a through-the-looking glass economy can go on developing and advancing; and once again he evokes those "centuries of world history and experience" to support a negative answer. He then adds:

> If by some miracle, the Reds do succeed, this would have a very great philosophical and cultural impact on the functioning of the world. But I am betting against such a miracle. I am also betting against the workability of a classless society with no noticeable distinctions between managers and workers, leaders and followers, experts and nonexperts, and mental and physical work. (p. 78)

We'll take those bets. As we see it, the Cultural Revolution is designed to make sure that China will accomplish just what Barry Richman and all the other bourgeois professors in the world regard as impossible. Marx and Engels believed it was possible. So did Lenin. So does Mao. We are happy to be in that company.

(April 10, 1967)

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Chinese people are carrying out a vigorous rectification movement in order to bring about the rapid development of socialism in China on a firmer basis. It is a movement for carrying out a nation-wide debate which is both guided and free, a debate in the city and the countryside on such questions as the socialist road versus the capitalist road, the basic system of the state and its major policies, the working style of Party and government functionaries, and the question of the welfare of the people, a debate which is conducted by setting forth facts and reasoning things out, so as correctly to resolve those actual contradictions among the people which demand immediate solution. This is a socialist movement for the self-education and self-remolding of the people.

—*Mao Tse-tung*, 1957

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA

BY E. L. WHEELWRIGHT

The precise origins of the proletarian cultural revolution are not clearly known; what is certain is that it is in the direct tradition of Mao's conception of revolution as a continuing process. "Central to this conception is the idea that the existing situation must be constantly reviewed and called into question to prevent the re-emergence of the former exploiting classes in positions of influence, in the form of repeated 'class struggle' movements, and a whole series of policies of 'thought reform' and 'rectification movements.' "* This idea has been put into practice on many occasions in the last thirty-odd years since Mao has been in charge of the Communist Party, both before and after it came to power in 1949. There are numerous examples: the "land verification" movement of the early 1930's, in which the land reform movement was regarded by Mao as a political quite as much as an economic measure, and at the same time a process of education of the peasantry; the "rectification" campaign conducted among the cadres of the Party in the early 1940's; the "thought reform" campaign among the intellectuals in 1950; the "Three Antis" campaign conducted among the Party cadres in 1951—against corruption, waste, and bureaucracy; the "Five Antis" campaign in 1952, directed against bribery, tax evasion, fraud, theft of government property, and theft of state economic secrets, by merchants and industrialists who were still operating their firms in a semi-autonomous manner; the "new rectification campaign" in 1957, directed against bureaucratic tendencies among cadres of the Party and the state.

The author is Professor of Economics at Sydney University, Australia. He was in China in November and December, 1966, at the invitation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, to study the Chinese economy. The article first appeared in the February issue of *Outlook*, the Australian independent socialist magazine, and was sent by Professor Wheelwright to MR with permission to reprint.—The Editors

* Stuart Schram, *Mao Tse-tung*, Pelican, 1966.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The basic concept behind all these campaigns is essentially the same: that the fundamental human values, the thoughts and motivations that people have are the crucial factor in the functioning of society; that even though there has been a political revolution in which state power has been captured, and an economic revolution in which all major productive assets are collectively owned, this is not enough to ensure the success of the revolution unless there is also a revolution in men's minds. Hence the object of these "exercises" is to construct a new morality—a new set of rules of human conduct in tune with the new collectivist society, based on the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "old morality" is held to be derived from the old bourgeois society of private ownership, and the private interest of the individual to be its fundamental attribute. The "new morality" must be related to the new collectivist society, and its fundamental attribute is to be the exaltation of the public interest over private interest, and of proletarian values over bourgeois values. This is the essential objective of all these campaigns, for Mao holds that the old ideas will not go away by themselves, but must be deliberately driven out, and new ones deliberately inculcated. The proletarian *cultural* revolution is no exception; the only difference is the intensity and the scale of operation, for it is not confined to selected groups such as intellectuals or party cadres, but is directed at *all* those in positions of authority in every field. It may therefore be regarded as the extension of previous attempts, on an enormous scale, but not as their culmination, for it is seen as a continuing process, which will be necessary for every successive generation, to ensure the "correct" ideological orientation of future leaders; "correct" of course means conformity with the basic tenets of the thought of Mao Tse-tung.

The techniques used in previous mass campaigns have included intense propaganda advocating the study of Mao's thought, widespread mass rallies involving literally millions of people, mass denunciations and public humiliation of the worst offenders, and public confessions and self-criticism by those who acknowledge their mistakes and undertake to reform themselves. In these campaigns there has been very little bloodletting, imprisonment, or even dismissal from office, the main

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressure being social and psychological, but of so intense a nature as to provoke suicide in a few cases. The language used is—to non-Chinese ears—highly colored with the accent on struggle and dramatic effects, with much use of military metaphors and Chinese symbolism, too often taken at their face value by Western correspondents. So far the cultural revolution has employed similar techniques, except that the scale of operation has been so much vaster than previous campaigns, and a new extra-party youth organization, the Red Guards, has come into existence to spearhead it.

II

Although the cultural revolution is undoubtedly in the mainstream of the tradition of the Chinese Communist Party under Mao's leadership, a most important factor affecting both its timing and intensity has been the emergence in Russia of what the Chinese have called *revisionism*. This is not the place to enter into the ideological dispute between the two Communist Parties; it will be sufficient to emphasize Mao's theory that classes continue to exist under socialism, and will continue to exist until the classless communist society is achieved, and the traditional divisions of labor are abolished. These are not classes in the old Marxist sense of their direct relation to the ownership of property, i.e. landlords, capitalists, workers, and peasants, but *functional* classes of workers, managers, peasants, party and state cadres, intellectuals, academics and other brain workers, soldiers, etc. It is held that contradictions still exist among these classes, and that these may develop into sharp antagonisms unless carefully handled. All this is the subject of a well-known essay by Mao, first published, significantly, in 1957, after the emergence of Khrushchev in the USSR.* A particularly dangerous contradiction is believed to exist between the masses and those in positions of authority over them, i.e. between the workers and peasants on the one hand and the managers, administrators, state and party cadres, and those in charge of educational and cultural institutions, on the other. Unless energetic steps are taken to prevent it, this contradiction can

* *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions amongst the People*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1957.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

develop into a fundamental antagonism between rulers and ruled, such that a privileged bureaucratic and technocratic class emerges with interests of its own, divergent from those of the common people. If this is allowed to happen, and especially if this privileged group still retains substantial remnants of the ideology of the old bourgeois society, the stage is set for revisionism, i.e. revision of the basic Marxist-Leninist tenets of revolutionary socialism, both internally and externally in relation to the imperialists. In short those in privileged positions of power will be more interested in keeping the status quo, both internally and externally, than in pressing on with revolutionary development both at home and abroad.

The Chinese Communist Party leaders believe that this happened in Russia after the death of Stalin, particularly with the emergence of Khrushchev, and that this happened primarily because Stalin did not acknowledge the existence of classes under socialism, and took no steps to resolve these contradictions; he merely attempted to eliminate opposition by purges. The only way to prevent the emergence of such a bureaucracy—which arises both within and without the party—is, Mao believes, by the thoroughgoing practice of democratic centralism, embodied in his slogan of "from the masses to the masses," and not by merely paying lip service to it. This means preventing the emergence of a style of life of the upper echelons too far removed from the masses: not only in dress, income, and other outward manifestations, but also in work, especially in attitudes to physical labor and the giving of orders. It is clear from his writings that Mao holds that in socialist society the proletariat cannot and should not be led by a group which elevates itself much above the common people in any respect, for then this category will revert to bourgeois traits and attitudes; rather the leaders of the proletariat should be leaders from within, who should live as closely as possible to the lives of the common people. Only in this way can the people be effectively mobilized, and their enthusiasm and initiative fully aroused. It is also abundantly clear that what they label revisionism made a deep impression on Mao and other party leaders, and strongly reinforced their traditional thinking on the subject.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Further, having decided that the Russian "revisionist" policy of peaceful co-existence has "sold the pass" as far as militant resistance to imperialism is concerned—by implicit agreement to keep the status quo in world affairs—Mao and his supporters have concluded that China may well be on its own in any future conflict with the United States. Military support has been promised to North Vietnam if its leaders request it from China, bombs are already dropping a few miles from her southwestern borders, she has been economically blockaded for years and menaced by a ring of United States military bases to the east and southeast, and has been officially branded as enemy number one by the United States. In these circumstances, and for good reasons, China feels that the probability of invasion, or at the very least bombing attacks by the United States, is very high. Consequently this is an additional reason for heightening revolutionary consciousness at home, rooting out "revisionism"—which in this context means sympathy with the "soft line" of the USSR to the United States—and uniting the nation in its determination to fight United States imperialism, should the need arise. China now sees itself as the major repository of revolutionary socialism, and one of the objectives of the cultural revolution is to ensure that there is no "backsliding" in this respect, or in Chinese terminology, that "China does not change its color."

III

What has been said so far must be seen against the background of the construction of socialism in China, and the problems that have had to be faced. Notwithstanding its 2,500 years or so of civilization, China was, at the time of the Communist victory ("Liberation," as the Chinese call it), a very backward country. It was semi-feudal, with five sixths of the population living in the countryside, under the heel of an oppressive landlord class; there was virtually no heavy industry, and light industry was confined to the larger cities on the coast, which also contained substantial trading and associated financial activities, many of which were under the control of foreign capitalists. The overwhelming majority of the population were peasants, mostly very poor and illiterate, riddled with the superstitions and value

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system characteristic of a semi-feudal social system. Most of the educated people in the countryside were drawn from the ranks of the landlord class and the middle and rich peasants. (Mao himself came from a family which probably began as poor peasants, but which managed to rise to the level of middle peasants, hence he was able to receive an education and become a school teacher in his early days.)

In the cities the ranks of the relatively small industrial and commercial proletariat would have included substantial numbers of educated people, but most of those in positions of authority, possessed of administering and organizational skills, would be drawn from the national bourgeoisie and comprador class, or from the scholar class recruited into government administration. This last category had traditionally held very powerful positions in Chinese society, for civil administration was in their hands; they were the product of a very conservative and elitist educational system, which during long and arduous years of Chinese classical education inculcated in them "bourgeois" values and a contempt for physical labor or technical or practical work, to an even greater extent than has been the case in Western countries at similar stages of development.

Thus, at the time of Liberation, China exhibited the basic problem of all backward countries attempting to construct a socialist society, i.e. an acute shortage of cadres to engage in the task. It is one thing to recruit sufficient dedicated leaders into the Communist Party from the ranks of peasants, workers, and intellectuals, to lead a predominantly peasant revolution to victory after a struggle lasting a quarter of a century—a tremendous and historic achievement in itself. It is quite another to produce sufficient numbers to engage in the task of socialist construction, to organize, inspire, and lead peasants into new collective units such as co-operatives and communes, to set up and manage new state-owned factories, to extend and run the transport system, organize public health services, administer towns and cities, build up an educational system, and all the myriads of other tasks which require the levels of education, skill and competence, which *ex hypothesi* are sadly lacking in a backward society.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So once the Revolution seizes power, and hardcore counter-revolutionaries have been executed or imprisoned, practically everyone who has the least competence is pressed into service. But the *dramatis personae* have not changed. The vast majority of former landlords continue to exist—not as landlords, it is true, but as peasants or workers on the communes in many cases; and those who managed to salvage part of their wealth in the form of *objets d'art* and jewelry, migrated to the cities and lived off their capital, or the interest on it. Municipal land has not yet been nationalized, and many landlords still draw rent from their property, although at controlled rates. Former middle and rich peasants still exist, and many live and work in the communes; of the older generation of peasants, they are the most articulate and educated, and can often sway the others even if they do not achieve positions of authority. The great mass of former peasants still exist, of course, but as members of a new collective form of organization which is not yet ten years old; they have responded astonishingly well to the new attitudes demanded of them, they are better off than they were, but especially among the older ones the old individual traditions and the superstitions of the old society still keep a strong hold.

Most of the former capitalists still exist, receiving 5 percent per annum on their investments in individual and commercial enterprises which have been taken over by the state; many also receive handsome salaries as managers (subject of course to state control), because there was no one else capable of running them. The old scholar class still exists, controlling educational institutions and administering the various organs of state.

In all this it has to be remembered that the first generation completely educated under the regime of the new society has yet to reach maturity; it is from this generation that the Red Guards are recruited.

An additional factor is important, that for a century before Liberation China was a semi-colony, in the sense that parts of it in the coastal cities had been ceded to various European imperialists in the form of trading concessions, and much of Chinese trade and cultural administration was in their hands; there were foreign invasions of one kind or another on no less than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

six occasions since the Opium Wars of 1840, and on the last occasion the Japanese occupied as much as one third of Chinese territory for the best part of a decade. The significance of this is twofold. First, the traditional Chinese society was breaking down under the impact of the Western incursions, for these were not only economic, political, and military, but also ideological and cultural; and the view was widespread that in order to survive, China would have to adopt many Western techniques and ideas. One concomitant of this was the beginning of a sense of inferiority and a lack of confidence which often exist side by side with anti-imperialist feelings in such semi-colonial situations. The second and more significant aspect is that in its later stages, especially during the anti-Japanese war, the revolution assumed in part the nationalist character of a patriotic war to unite the nation and throw out the foreign invaders. This meant that when the Communist leadership had demonstrated its ability, integrity, and superiority over the discredited and corrupt Kuomintang—especially in the struggle against the Japanese—many people, especially intellectuals, cast in their lot with the Revolution, although ideologically they were far from convinced Communists. They had reached the conclusion that this was the only hope if China was to "stand up" and become a strong, proud nation once more; in short their motivation was nationalistic and patriotic rather than revolutionary. The same is true of many scholars and others who returned to China in the early years of Liberation, often after spending a considerable number of years in Western educational institutions; this is especially true of scientists, many of whom were educated in the United States and the United Kingdom. A substantial proportion of these repatriates returned, not because they were Communists, but partly because of patriotism and national pride, and partly because for the first time in this century there existed in China a stable government that wanted to foster science and technology, and offered them good prospects. With them they brought not only their expertise but often many of the values acquired from Western education, which is not notable for its inculcation of socialist values.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV

These, then, are the basic reasons for the series of "thought reform" campaigns, of which the proletarian cultural revolution is the latest and the most spectacular example. The term "culture" is used in a very wide sense; one of the clearest expressions of the nature and purpose of the cultural revolution appeared in an editorial in the army newspaper:

> Conducted mainly in the ideological field, fundamentally it is a great revolution to destroy the thousands-of-years-old concept of private ownership and establish the socialist concept of public ownership. . . . Ideas, culture, customs, habits, political views, legal concepts, views on art and so on are all ideological forms in society, which generally go under the name of culture. Why must we carry out a cultural revolution in the period of socialism? The reason is that the economic base of society has undergone fundamental change. It is a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism, of Mao Tse-tung's thought, that the mental springs from the material and social consciousness arises out of social being, out of the social economic base and the social system of ownership. Social consciousness is secondary; at the same time it has a tremendous influence and impact on social being. In China, the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production has already been effected and the socialist economic system of public ownership has been established. Since the economic base has changed, the ideological superstructure must change accordingly to keep step with it. Otherwise it will obstruct the consolidation of socialist ownership, prevent the new social productive forces from developing, lead to the loss of the already-won fruits of the revolution, and give rise to revisionist rule and the restoration of capitalism, causing our country to go back on to the old colonial or semi-colonial and feudal or semi-feudal road. . . .*

The term "cultural revolution" is, according to Western usage, something of a misnomer; a better term would be "ideological revolution." It is probable that this nomenclature was adopted because in its early stages the movement began in the cultural field. One of the first salvos was fired by Mao Tse-tung in 1964, when he claimed that in the past 15 years the literary and art circles, with some exceptions, had not carried out the policies of the Party and had acted as high and mighty bureaucrats, had not gone to the workers, peasants, and soldiers, and

* *Liberation Army Daily*, November 3, 1966.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had not reflected the socialist revolution and socialist construction. In recent years they had even slid to the verge of "revisionism."* In September, 1965, Mao pointed out that reactionary bourgeois academic authorities should be criticized. As a result, in November of the same year the Shanghai Committee of the Communist Party published in its newspaper a major criticism of literary material for which the Peking Committee of the Party had been responsible. This led eventually in June, 1966, to the dismissal of certain officers of the Peking Party, to its reorganization, and the dismissal of the editorial board of the newspapers and journals for which it was responsible. *Peking Review* of June 10, 1966, declared:

> The overthrown bourgeoisie, in their plots for restoration and subversion, always give first place to ideology, take hold of ideology and the superstructure. The representatives of the bourgeoisie, by using their position and power, usurped and controlled the leadership of a number of departments, did all they could to spread bourgeois and revisionist poison through the media of literature, the theatre, films, music, the arts, the press, periodicals, the radio, publications and academic research and in schools, etc., in an attempt to corrupt people's minds and perpetrate "peaceful evolution" as ideological preparation and preparation of public opinion for capitalist restoration.

The power struggle in the Party had begun, between those who wanted to continue and expand the ideological revolution, of which the previous "thought reform" campaigns had been in fact a part, and those who opposed it. The initial "battle" was thus joined on the cultural "front." At about the same time the struggle on the educational "front" at Peking University came into the open; the following account of this is by a regular visitor to China, Lee Tsung-ying, editor of the Hong Kong journal *Eastern Horizon* (January 1967):

> In the wake of the reorganization of the Peking Party Committee, the President of Peking University, Lu Ping, and his lieutenants were toppled by a single issue of *tatzupao* (big character poster) put up by a group of philosophy students who had been at loggerheads with Lu for the preceding seven months or so. Early in 1966, during the Socialist Education Movement, these students and some

* *Chinese Literature*, No. 10, 1966.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others came to the conclusion that University authority had been following a policy which they believed to be bourgeois and reactionary. They pointed out, for instance, that the University had been persistently discriminating against students of worker or peasant family origins and against demobilized PLA (People's Liberation Army) men who had enrolled for higher studies by expelling them on all sorts of pretexts, instead of rendering positive assistance to those who were backward in their lessons to enable them to catch up; had been allowing ordinary academic subjects to squeeze out political study, especially the study of Chairman Mao's works; and had been discouraging students from doing manual work. They accused Lu of deliberately training the coming generation in the bourgeois rather than the proletarian tradition. Instead of carefully considering the criticisms, Lu and his followers put heavy pressure to bear on the group of students, labelling them as anti-socialist or anti-Party elements. For seven months, vigorous exchanges of accusations and counter-accusations went on between the University authority and the students.

After the cultural revolution had been launched, the students began to see things in a much clearer light and became more firmly convinced that they had been right. So seven of them (many others had been sent to the countryside to do manual work on the farms by Lu Ping, who had suddenly acquired a zest for manual work) put up on May 25 a *tatzupao* accusing Lu and his lieutenants of opposing and suppressing the mass revolutionary movement in order to protect their superiors in the Peking Party Committee and themselves. The poster came to Chairman Mao's notice on June 1, and he requested the Central People's Broadcasting Station to release it on the very same day.

The next morning, the walls of Peking University were covered with big character posters, and a little later they appeared on the walls of thousands of schools and educational institutions all over the country. The organized Peking Party Committee dissolved the Peking University Party Committee, and dismissed Lu Ping and some of his colleagues. There was resistance to the new movement from within the Party, and the customary Party practice of sending "work teams" to various schools and institutes was tried. As far as can be made out these are rather like "trouble shooting" groups of leading Party cadres who are sent to remedy difficulties. This was however a new situation, for they were not accustomed to such tasks in educational institutions; probably they failed to see the significance of the movement, which was new, and not unnaturally tended

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to side with the "establishment" against the revolt of the students and some of the younger teachers. Consequently the work teams attempted to control the "cultural revolutionaries," to restrict their activities, and in some cases even instigated other groups to oppose them. Lee Tsung-ying points out that this opposition led to a detailed declaration of official Party policy on the whole question of the objectives and methods of the new movement:

> This opposition to the new movement led to the holding of the Eleventh Plenary session of the Eighth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, during which a decision concerning the cultural revolution was adopted on August 8. It has become commonly known as the Sixteen Points and was reported to have been drafted under Mao's personal guidance. It exhorts cadres at various echelons to put daring above everything else, to support the putting up of big-character posters and the holding of great debates, to trust the masses, to rely on them, respect their initiative and encourage them to criticize the shortcomings and errors in the work of those holding responsible positions. It prescribes that in the cultural revolution the only method is for the masses to liberate themselves, and any method of doing things in their stead must not be used. This was later known as the proletarian line represented by Chairman Mao Tse-tung.
>
> The decision specifies that, "at present, our objective is to struggle against and overthrow those persons in authority who are taking the capitalist road, to criticize and repudiate the reactionary bourgeois academic 'authorities' and the ideology of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, and to transform education, literature, and art and all other parts of the superstructure not in correspondence with the socialist economic base, so as to facilitate the consolidation and development of the socialist system."
>
> Work teams were withdrawn and the direction of the cultural revolution was left in the hands of the Committee for Cultural Revolution whose members had been democratically elected in each school or institute.
>
> Ten days later, Chairman Mao joined one million people from the revolutionary masses of Peking and many other parts of the country in a mammoth rally celebrating the birth of the cultural revolution. It was at this meeting that the Red Guards were first made known to the outside world when a detachment of them ascended the rostrum of the Tien An Men Gate and Mao himself put on their armband.

Clearly, Mao and his supporters are using the Red Guards as the spearhead of the revolution, but it seems unlikely that,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

initially, they were an "official creation" at all. To begin with, they were clandestine organizations of young students, frowned on by authority, who could not reconcile the principles of socialism under which they had been brought up, with the principles and practices of the education they were receiving, and with some of the things they knew still existed in Chinese society. Apparently the first group originated in a middle secondary school which was a subsidiary or "feeder" for Tsinghua University. Undoubtedly influenced by the ferment going on in Peking University, the young rebels formed themselves into a group and called themselves the Red Guards (the name was taken from a civilian organization which sprang up in the early days of the revolution in Hunan province in 1926). Similar groups came into existence in other schools and universities in the Peking area, and then in adjacent cities such as Tientsin. Originally "underground" for several months, the movement spread like wildfire when Mao gave them his blessing. When a Tientsin group announced their intention to march to Peking to demonstrate, Mao gave instructions to put a train at their disposal. From then on the movement mushroomed all over China; the astonishing rapidity and scale of its development must have surprised Mao and his supporters within the Party, and naturally they capitalized on it. Within three months, some 15-20 million young people had formed themselves into Red Guards, organized on the basis of their educational institutions; they are mainly students of middle schools and higher educational institutions aged between 10 and about 20, with a sprinkling of young teachers. The only conditions for membership—which they control themselves—are militant support for Mao's proletarian cultural revolution, and a proletarian class background—i.e. that members come from families of workers, peasants, "martyrs of the revolution," PLA men, and so on. Their sole distinguishing characteristic is the red armband they wear, with the Red Guard inscription, and they are of course unarmed; they all carry the little red book of quotations from Mao which they wave and read from at the slightest provocation.

They were all offered free rail transport anywhere in China, free food, and free accommodation in middle schools, universities, etc. (which have not reopened after the summer vacation).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At a mass rally of over 1 million in Peking in August, 1966, they were reviewed by Mao, and enjoined by various leaders of the Central Committee to be the standard bearers of the revolution, to pay attention to state affairs, to criticize everyone in authority, to propagate the cultural revolution in society at large—to destroy old ideas, culture, customs, and habits and foster new ones, to "integrate" themselves with peasants and workers, to eschew violence "which can only touch skins" and concentrate on reason "which touches souls," to model themselves on the exemplary code of conduct adopted by the PLA men in pre-revolutionary days. All this, of course, to be in conformity with Mao's thought, which must be studied and applied "in a creative way."*

Millions more came to Peking to be reviewed by Mao in similar circumstances. This continued till mid-November, by which time an estimated 9-10 million had come to Peking. At any one time between August and November, there were estimated to be 2 million Red Guards there—an increase in the population of the inner city of 50 percent. Thousands of extra buses were brought from other cities, temporary latrines and water pipes were erected in the side-streets, and millions of square yards of temporary "walls" of matting erected to contain the profusion of big character posters that brick walls could not accommodate. In November, the young people were exhorted not to come to Peking any more, but to fan out to the other cities and the countryside; and in late December it was stated that no more travel passes would be issued except for return to the home base. Emphasis was then placed on walking—in emulation of the Long March—to "temper" the young people, and marchers were a common sight, walking in small groups, with packs on their backs, always carrying red flags, sometimes with musical instruments and singing revolutionary songs. They did propaganda work and manual labor in the villages and construction sites along the route; many of them walked thousands of kilometers, and especially favored were routes which included places of significance in the history of the revolution. During the early stages, in July and August, there was some

* *Peking Review*, September 9, 1966.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violence; houses of those suspected of "taking the capitalist road" were ransacked, some places of religion and worship were desecrated, and some people were beaten up. These deplorable incidents were of course singled out by the Western press, but they must be seen in the perspective of the enormous size of the Chinese population which exceeds that of the United States, the USSR, and the whole of Western Europe. The Red Guards claimed to have discovered caches of gold bars, detailed lists of landholdings by former landlords, and even radio transmitters. But the early outbreaks of violence were soon brought under control, and serious resistance did not materialize until early in 1967. To the foreign observer in November and December, who could not avoid seeing and being in close contact with literally millions of these young teenagers wherever he went in China, they appeared very disciplined, well-behaved, and incredibly patient, waiting hours and even days for the buses and trains of an acutely overstrained public transport system.

An outstanding feature is the big character poster. It is almost as though all the letters to the editor of all the newspapers in a Western country were simultaneously on display on the walls of all the public buildings, ignoring the laws of libel. Millions of these posters have gone up criticizing *everybody* in authority—even a few criticizing Mao and his supporters. Naturally there is much stupidity and much inaccurate information, and the Western press is not slow to report the most sensational. Almost certainly the great majority of the accusations and counter-accusations are spontaneous, but there is most probably an element of manipulation, especially as far as attacks on the "heavies" (VIP's) are concerned. As to the mechanism of this, and the cases in which certain people are seized, denounced, and publicly humiliated, the foreigner without inside knowledge of the power struggle can only be ignorant; it certainly appears contrary to the 16-point decision of the Central Committee, which stated, *inter alia*:

> The strictest care should be taken to distinguish between the anti-Party, anti-socialist Rightists and those who support the Party and socialism but have said or done something wrong or have written some bad articles or other works. . . . The method to be used in debates is to present the facts, reason things out, and per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suade through reasoning. Any method of forcing a minority holding different views to submit is impermissible. The minority should be protected, because sometimes the truth is with the minority. . . . In the course of the movement, with the exception of cases of active counter-revolutionaries where there is clear evidence of crimes . . . which should be handled in accordance with the law, no measures should be taken against students at universities, colleges, middle schools and primary schools because of problems that arise in the movement. To prevent the struggle from being diverted from its main target, it is not allowed, under whatever pretext, to incite the masses or the students to struggle against each other. Even proven Rightists should be dealt with on the merits of each case at a later stage of the movement.

In the light of these directives, it appears that the situation has sometimes got out of hand, probably as a result of much fiercer opposition than anticipated, although it is fair to point out that the directive noted:

> Since the cultural revolution is a revolution, it inevitably meets with resistance. This resistance comes chiefly from those in authority who have wormed their way into the Party and are taking the capitalist road. It also comes from the force of habits from the old society. At present, this resistance is still fairly strong and stubborn. But after all, the great proletarian cultural revolution is an irresistible general trend. There is abundant evidence that such resistance will be quickly broken down once the masses become fully aroused.
>
> Because the resistance is fairly strong, there will be reversals and even repeated reversals in this struggle. There is no harm in this. It tempers the proletariat and other working people, and especially the younger generation, teaches them lessons and gives them experience, and helps them to understand that the revolutionary road zigzags and does not run smoothly.
>
> The outcome of this great cultural revolution will be determined by whether or not the Party leadership dares boldly to arouse the masses. . . . (*Peking Review,* August 12, 1966.)

Obviously a mass movement on such a scale which attacks "officialdom" both within and without the Party is bound to generate opposition, especially as it spreads out from culture and education to the factories, the communes, and public administration generally. Opposition is probably by no means limited to the "bureaucratic backlash," but almost certainly includes opposition in high places by those who disagree with Mao's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"hard line" in foreign policy, especially vis-à-vis the USSR, and those who fear disruption of the economy. In addition those with personal resentments, private grudges, etc., against the regime would naturally exploit the opportunities presented by the upheaval. Reports of armed clashes, violence, riots, and rebellion in the Western press are undoubtedly greatly exaggerated, and suggestions that China is on the verge of civil war are merely wishful thinking. An accurate assessment of the current situation cannot be made until reliable reports are available; however to anyone who has travelled widely in China in recent months it is inconceivable that the anti-Mao forces can achieve more than ephemeral success. Given the lack of reliable information—and this includes the shockingly bad accounts which emanate from the official Chinese foreign language publications —it is difficult for socialists to interpret what is going on. If this interpretation by one who has recently been there—and who neither reads nor speaks Chinese—is anywhere near the truth, then these events are of fundamental interest for socialists everywhere, whatever their outcome.

In our country bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, anti-Marxist ideology, will continue to exist for a long time. Basically, the socialist system has been established in our country. We have won the basic victory in transforming the ownership of the means of production, but we have not yet won complete victory on the political and ideological fronts. In the ideological field, the question of who will win in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has not been really settled yet. We still have to wage a protracted struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. It is wrong not to understand this and to give up ideological struggle. All erroneous ideas, all poisonous weeds, all ghosts and monsters, must be subjected to criticism; in no circumstance should they be allowed to spread unchecked. However, the criticism should be fully reasoned, analytical and convincing, and not rough, bureaucratic, metaphysical or dogmatic.

—*Mao Tse-tung*, 1957

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LESSON OF INDONESIA

BY DONALD BARNETT

Despite the atrocious slaughter of an estimated 500,000 communists, their families and supporters, by the Indonesian military and right-wing (with CIA assistance), there has not yet emerged a peasant-based revolutionary movement bent on resisting the counter-revolutionary terror of the military-fascist junta with revolutionary violence. The historical message here seems quite clear and very important—if not for all socialists, then at least for those in the neo-colonized nations of the American Empire and its weaker European-centered satellites:

(1) Urban-based Communist Parties which adopt a primarily parliamentary strategy, practice coalition politics, unreservedly support nationalist, albeit anti-imperialist, leaders, and attempt to build a mass party on anything less than a program clearly oriented toward achieving a workers-and-peasants' state defended by armed peasant-worker power, render themselves structurally, organizationally, and ideologically incapable of either achieving state power or effectively resisting the armed repression of the combined imperialist, national bourgeois, right-wing, and military forces.

(2) The organized physical force of the imperialists and local military, and their ideological commitment to use violent means, must be confronted by a revolutionary, peasant-based, well-organized movement ideologically prepared to resist counter-revolutionary violence with revolutionary counter-violence.

The assumption here is that non-revolutionary socialist parties (i.e. those "left" parties which elevate parliamentary tactics to the level of strategic primacy) both impede—if they do not reverse—the development of precisely those subjective conditions which are necessary to effectively resist counter-revolutionary

---

Donald Barnett, co-author with Karari Njama of MR Press book, *Mau-Mau From Within,* is Assistant Professor of Anthropology at the University of Iowa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violence and achieve a worker-peasant state, and yield a structure which is lacking in sufficient flexibility to adjust and adapt itself to meet repressionary violence and carry through the revolution. It is often said that in places such as India and Indonesia, Ghana, Kenya, and Chile, there exist strong pressures for communists to organize themselves into a parliamentary party. This is certainly true. The point, however, is that these pressures can and must be resisted if future impotence and bloodbaths are to be avoided.

The major assumption being rejected here is that "constitutionalist" communist parties, or their equivalents, are a necessary or progressive stage in the historic progression to worker-peasant states. The reasoning based on this assumption—i.e. that parliamentary "left" parties will respond to violent repressive measures by leading the masses in a popular revolution—seems patently falsified by contemporary historic events. Recent events in nations such as Brazil, Indonesia, Ghana, Cuba, and Vietnam seem to indicate that a minimum requirement for successful revolutions is a revolutionary party and leadership which imbues the masses with revolutionary consciousness through its own revolutionary action.

Again, recent history informs us that as the parliamentary power of "communist" or other "left" parties increases, so proportionately does their revolutionary potential decrease. Note Italy and Chile. And that where parliamentary power is in fact achieved by such "left" parties through non-revolutionary means (whether in the case of a Ghana or an England) they are not capable, nor in many cases are they even desirous, of implementing those structural and ideological transformations without which their accession to "power" remains historically insignificant, if not irrelevant.

Disobedience, in the eyes of any one who has read history, is man's original virtue. It is through disobedience that progress has been made, through disobedience and through rebellion.

—*Oscar Wilde, The Soul of Man under Socialism*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OMEGNA PRIZE

On the evening of March 29 the editors of MR received the Omegna Prize for 1966 at a ceremony held in the Casa della Cultura in Milan, Italy. This was preceded by a visit to Omegna during the day, a reception at the Omegna town hall, and a luncheon at the Hotel San Rocco in the nearby resort town of Orta on the beautiful Lake of Orta which nestles in the foothills of the Alps a few miles west of Lake Maggiore. We print below the opening statement at the evening ceremony by Signor Boldini, the Mayor of Omegna, the responding remarks of the prize recipients, and part of the statement by the judges in announcing the award.—The Editors

SIGNOR ANGELO BOLDINI

I should like first of all to thank, in the name of the City of Omegna, the directors of the Casa della Cultura, who have once again graciously offered their hospitality for the presentation ceremony of the annual award of the Omegna Prize, thus reaffirming their understanding of the true significance this prize carries, over and above the monetary sum granted to its winners.

Our thanks are also due to the members of the jury—and especially to this year's president, Professor Antonielli—who, by their totally selfless labors, express so well the prize's intent and the qualities for which it is awarded. They understand that its primary aim transcends the publicizing of one or another literary work or publishing house.

The Omegna prize—by its very name: "Prize of the Resistance"—has its own symbolic meaning. The Municipal Council would not presume to award a prize based on literary criteria alone, because there are few *literati* among its members. The Council represents the citizenry of Omegna, composed largely of working people, who all too often have had to battle economic difficulties, and of others who, though of a different social category, have lived through periods of difficulty for those who were on the side of liberty.

This explains why there were democratic public servants in Omegna even before fascism and it provides a logical explanation for the prompt and unhesitating advent of the movement of resistance to Nazi-fascism as soon as objective conditions made it possible.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus it was that, in September 1943, the organized Resistance was launched by the young factory workers of Omegna, together with the sons of other anti-fascists who for so many years had had to remain silent.

This first group was privileged in having an illustrious commander, Captain Filippo Maria Beltrami, a spiritual son of these hills. Though from a very different background, he nonetheless shared with all of us the great desire to see Italy's freedom.

This early concentration of forces continued to grow and spread into other regions; and it was the totality of these forces that gave life to the glorious movement of armed resistance to fascism and to the German invader.

Already in the first days of November 1943, this city made direct contact with partisan units; its enthusiasm and support for the Resistance Movement were surely second to none.

Many fell during that period of struggle, leaving large numbers of families to mourn. Though not bearers of names of renown, they were all heroes. All of us recognize the sacrifices made by Commander Beltrami and those men of Megolo, Citterio, Di Dio, and Pajetta who met their death along with many others, and who are a symbol not only for their bereaved survivors but for all our families, as they shall be for generations to come.

It is this that the Omegna Prize is meant to convey: this struggle, this resistance which, for Omegna's hardworking population constitutes the most beautiful poetry.

And it is this that I wish to convey, in the name of the City of Omegna, to the winners of the seventh annual award, Messrs. Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy. We are grateful to them for having accepted our invitation to be present this morning at a brief ceremony in our modest city. We cannot boast of important intellectual institutions. However, the citizens of Omegna—hard workers, who have undergone difficult times in recent years in their struggle for the defense of labor—urge that it not be the monetary value of the prize (which will now be presented to the winners) that shall convey the values and the will of our citizenry. It is rather our continuing tenacious strug-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gle for liberty which will be the best prize for those who, so far away in vast America, struggle, even though under less bloody circumstances, for the liberty of their people and for the liberty of mankind, without regard for color or race.

Such is the higher motive for the granting of this award. In conclusion, I thank you all in the name of Omegna, industrious and Partisan.

LEO HUBERMAN

In all systems of government, honors and prizes are conferred on those who uphold the status quo, not on those who oppose it. Paul Sweezy and I have been Marxist socialists all our mature lives and, in our lectures, books, and magazine, we have openly and proudly proclaimed our faith. Our own government has honored us, not with prizes, but with harassment before witch-hunting committees, in an effort to punish us for our radicalism. The Omegna Award is, therefore, of especial significance for us. It bolsters us in our determination to speak the truth as we see it, to carry on the struggle against American imperialism, to do everything we can to overthrow capitalism in the United States.

In addition to its spiritual uplift, the Omegna Award helps us in another, extremely important and practical fashion. Socialist magazines in capitalist United States are always poor, always in financial trouble. We are going to turn over to our magazine, MONTHLY REVIEW, the one million lire prize you have awarded to us.

Whenever we leave the United States and meet with friends in other countries, we are embarrassed by their solicitude for our welfare, their concern over the dangers we run in openly opposing the imperialist policy of our government. It is true that the life we lead has its troubles, its woes, its disadvantages, but please do not feel sorry for us. Paul Sweezy and I are among the luckiest of men. Few people, anywhere in the world, are so fortunate as to be doing the work they most want to do. Most people believe one thing and work at something else—too often

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at a job which runs directly counter to their beliefs. They are the ones to be pitied, not we. Paul Sweezy and I belong to that tiny group of people who have been able to couple their beliefs with their work—rare good fortune in this unhappy world.

Our independent socialist magazine, MONTHLY REVIEW, was founded in 1949, but our political commitment began many years before that. We belong to that generation which is known in our country as the Old Left, as distinguished from the younger generation of radicals called the New Left.

Our generation, the Old Left, is much smaller today than it once was. The breakdown of capitalism in the 1930's brought many people into the ranks, not on the basis of a Marxist analysis of capitalist society, but on the wings of emotion generated by the unemployment and suffering of the great depression. The prosperity that followed America's entrance into the war in 1941 saw many of these newcomers leave the ranks of radicalism.

They were joined, in large numbers, after 1956, by hitherto staunch Leftists who became disillusioned with socialism following the occupation of Hungary and the Khrushchev revelations of the crimes of Stalin. Some of these people became so embittered by the failure of their dream that they not only left the movement but became its most vindictive enemies to the point of informing on their closest comrades. Others lost all interest in socialism and made peace with the capitalist society in which they lived. Their genuine ability, coupled with the organizing skills and discipline of work they had learned in the movement, served them well in the attainment of the good life they sought now—not for others, but for themselves. They are rich ex-radicals, no longer concerned with the serious problems which affect mankind but only with more personal problems, such as whether their swimming pool should be 150 feet instead of 100, and what to do about their sons or daughters who have dropped out of college and have taken to drugs.

Some ex-radicals, both rich and poor, have deserted the movement with their bodies but have remained with it in their hearts. It no longer fires them with enthusiasm but it tugs at their conscience and, from time to time, they contribute their financial support to its press and to some of its various activities.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still another group, unmoved by all that has happened, continues in its previous pattern of following a line handed down to them, regardless of the fact that that line finds new virtues in the old capitalism and puts the attainment of socialism, by means refuted by history, on the agenda of some distant tomorrow instead of now.

What remains of the Old Left, to which Sweezy and I belong, is a mere handful of people, maybe 50,000 at most, out of a U.S. population of 190 million. There were two fundamental points in our philosophy—the evils of capitalism, inherent in its structure, and the inevitable eradication of those evils with the attainment of socialism. On the first point, we remain convinced, in spite of all the currently fashionable talk about how "capitalism has changed," "imperialism is not what it used to be," etc. We have examined the evidence and we cling to our belief that capitalism is, by its very nature, an unjust, immoral, irrational, wasteful system, with a built-in imperialism that pillages the wealth of the underdeveloped countries and brings wars which spell death to millions of people and wholesale devastation to their lands. The underlying horror remains the same though the fashions in weapons change—the victims were transported to Hitler's crematoria; U.S. imperialism flies the crematoria to the Vietnamese.

The injustice inherent in U.S. capitalism is greater now than ever before because the resources and technology are available to bring the good life, not just to the privileged, but to all the people. Yet the fact is that there are large numbers of desperately poor in today's "affluent" America. President Johnson himself gave the figures in a message to Congress just a few weeks ago:

- 60 percent of all poor children—three out of every five—never see a dentist, in affluent America.
- 60 percent of all poor children with disabling handicaps—three out of every five—do not receive medical care, in affluent America.
- In their first year of life, the death rate of poor babies is 50 percent higher than that of those who are not poor, in affluent America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The plight of the Negroes—the colonial people within our own borders—is especially desperate in affluent America. If you have a black skin you are more apt to die at birth, your illness is more likely to be fatal, your life expectancy is shorter, your income will be much lower, the house you live in will be inferior, the education you receive will be poorer, your chance of getting and holding a job will be slimmer.

It is obvious, then, that our old socialist indictment of capitalism is still valid. But the second basic point in our philosophy, that with the attainment of socialism all the evils of capitalism would be cured, needs re-examination. We must look very carefully at socialist regimes everywhere, in China, in Cuba, and especially in the Soviet Union with its half-century of experience. We will find that its accomplishments in improving the conditions of life for the masses have been nothing short of miraculous—proof indeed of the advantages of production for use not for profit, of centralized economic planning in the interest of society as a whole, of a concern for human beings not for money; in short, proof of the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Much of what we thought would happen has indeed happened in the fifty years of socialism in the Soviet Union. We looked for the transformation of the nation from underdevelopment to development and that has come to pass; we anticipated the transformation of the masses from backwardness and degradation to modernization and dignity and that has been achieved. Nevertheless, many of our expectations have not been fulfilled, and many defects and distortions, even evils, of which we never dreamed, have come with the advent of socialism. We know now what we did not suspect before:

• That the difficulties are greater than we anticipated; that the successes are accompanied by so much blood and tears as sometimes to prompt the question, even from those who are aware of the higher toll of lives in capitalist society, "Was it worthwhile?"

• That the overthrow of capitalism and the inauguration of socialism do not rapidly result in the birth of Socialist Man. Material incentives which breed selfishness are the spur in capi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talist society; to the extent that they are not replaced by moral incentives in socialist society, there will be no Socialist Man.

- That inequality, privilege, and bureaucracy do not disappear but have to be fought against continually.

- That the refusal by the ruling group to come to grips with its own history, to trust in practice the masses whom it glorifies in theory, leads to a separation of the people from the government, to a gap between the "we" and the "they."

- That disagreements and rivalries between socialist states can match, in intensity, those between capitalist nations.

- That the struggle to win socialism is only part of the battle; after it is won, the struggle must continue—to make the new society decent.

This is a sobering perspective but if we grasp it, if we learn to practice Marx's motto, "To doubt everything," we will spare ourselves heartaches and further disillusionment in time to come.

Meanwhile we can rejoice in the fact that major advances have been made, as illustrated in the following story:

Two counter-revolutionaries from Cuba were having their shoes shined in Miami. One said to the other: "When I return to Cuba, I shall be much better off than I was. Before the Revolution, I owned 10,000 acres of land, of which only 2,000 were cultivated. Castro has cleared all the land and planted it, so when I go back I shall be richer than ever."

The bootblack started to laugh.

The other man said: "I'm in the same position. On my land in the old days, there were many old broken-down *bohíos*. The Castro regime has torn them all down and replaced them with beautiful, modern, workers' houses. So I too, on my return, will be wealthier than ever before."

The bootblack was roaring with laughter. The men frowned at him and shouted: "What the hell are you laughing at?"

The bootblack rose to his full height, bowed gracefully, and replied: "Gentlemen, allow me to introduce myself—Count Sergei Alexander Petrovsky, nephew of the Czar."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAUL M. SWEEZY

I share my colleague Leo Huberman's pleasure and gratitude on receiving this honor. Our magazine and our writing are highly political, and most of the capitalist world's prizes for work of the kind we do we would not want, even if they were offered to us—which of course they will not be. The Omegna Award is different. We are proud to accept it and proud to join the very distinguished group who have been similarly honored in the past.

I would like, in the few minutes available to me, to say a few words about the subject of the volume for which the prize was awarded—the theory of American foreign policy. If we were re-writing those essays today, there is probably not much that we would feel obliged to reject as outright error. But of course there would be much to add, faulty judgments to correct, and emphases to change. I would like to focus my remarks this evening on a question of most immediate concern to you here in Italy and in the other countries of advanced European capitalism.

A few years ago it looked as though a great struggle was shaping up in the capitalist world. The United States emerged from the Second World War in a position of undisputed leadership. In its own interest it helped the stricken capitalist countries of Europe to their feet again. In so doing, it seemed, it had, by a dialectical twist, created a rival capable of challenging its domination of the world capitalist order. Even without Britain, Europe had the necessary manpower, the necessary natural resources, the necessary command of science and technology. What was missing, it seemed, was unity and organization—and these the Common Market promised to provide. The bourgeoisie of Europe was going to pull itself together and gird its loins for a struggle to regain the positions of world leadership it had so long held. The days of undisputed American hegemony were numbered.

So it seemed a few short years ago. But today this vision has far less plausibility. On the surface this is perhaps not obvious. Gaullist France has followed an apparently anti-American policy, drawing down America's gold reserve, undermining

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the structure of NATO, recognizing the People's Republic of China, and condemning United States policy in what was once France's Southeast Asian empire. Moreover, the end of the Adenauer-Erhard era in West Germany saw a cooling of relations between Bonn and Washington and a corresponding rapprochement between Bonn and Paris. All of these developments are consistent with the theory that a capitalist power strong enough to challenge American hegemony was in the making.

But these are not really the developments which count in the long run. If Europe were serious about challenging American power, it would first of all have to establish secure control over the decisive, dynamic sectors of its own economy—the industries which have led, are leading, and will continue to lead the scientific-industrial revolution of the 20th century—electronics, atomics, aero-space, synthetics and their associated research and development establishments. This is precisely what Europe has *not* done. I have no time to cite chapter and verse (this, incidentally, is an area which requires much more attention from the social sciences). I will only say that Gaullist France has been little more effective than its openly pro-American partners in stemming the massive invasion of American capital which has already, I believe, captured what are today the "commanding heights" of the European capitalist economy. The Machines Bull affair, if not a decisive turning point, was at any rate proof that the French bourgeoisie is either too divided or too weak—more likely both too divided and too weak—to fight for its own independence and Europe's future.

Moreover I think there can be little doubt that what is true of France is true of the rest of Europe—only more so. Everywhere, American capital has penetrated deeply and has tied large segments of the bourgeoisie—including some of the youngest and most vigorous elements in the new technological industries—to its chariot. Everywhere this process is continuing without let-up and perhaps even at an accelerating pace. The chance that the older, technologically more backward, more nationalistically oriented segments of the European bourgeoisie can make a stand, can halt and reverse this fateful process now seems to me very small indeed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To convince yourself that this is so, you need only ask what would be required to repulse and roll back the invasion of American capital. The answer is a whole series of drastic measures aimed at the control and elimination of American capital and at the mobilization of resources for a prolonged and bitter struggle against the ruthless counter-offensive which would surely be mounted from Washington and New York.

Who can doubt that if such a struggle were joined, the whole capitalist world would be shaken, or that explosions and crises reminiscent of the period 1929-1933 would be highly likely? Quiescent strata of the population, especially among workers and petty bourgeoisie, would be awakened from their present lethargy. Revolutionary struggles in the underdeveloped countries would be greatly stimulated. Inside the socialist camp, new hopes of taking advantage of capitalist rivalries and contradictions, new possibilities for overtaking and surpassing capitalism materially and morally would be brought to life.

Does the European bourgeoisie want these things? Does any significant part of it want these things? I do not believe so. Even those segments which are unhappy about the American penetration feel that it is better to "leave well enough alone." Independence would be preferable, but it is not worth fighting for at the cost of undermining and weakening the capitalist system as a whole. I believe that even the extreme Gaullists feel this way. Better the Americans than the risk of Revolution!

We cannot *blame* for these attitudes. It is not for us to tell them how to conduct their affairs. But we can and must analyze the consequences of this *laissez-faire, laissez-passer* policy toward American capital. The laws of capitalist economics favor the strong over the weak, and this holds for nations as well as for enterprises and individuals. To put the matter quite bluntly: Europe is on the way to becoming a neo-colony of the United States. The process is still no doubt in its early stages, and it may take years to complete. But the reality cannot be denied. Nor can the destination which lies ahead be hidden from those with eyes to see and courage to look.

Unfortunately, I have no time to elaborate on this theme this evening. I will only say that all historical experience teaches us that colonies lose not only their political freedom and their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignity but also the power to control their own economic destiny. And I mean this not only for backward countries with illiterate populations, but also for relatively advanced countries with highly educated populations and promising industrial potentials. If you want an example among others, I give you Argentina, which, taken as a whole, is undoubtedly the most advanced country in Latin America and yet today is—by very reason of its more advanced condition—the most pitiful and abject neo-colony in the United States empire. It is something like the fate of Argentina which awaits capitalist Europe at the end of the road it is now travelling.

For reasons I have already alluded to, Europe cannot expect salvation from its bourgeoisie. You cannot, in the last third of the 20th century, oppose American capitalism without endangering capitalism itself. And this the European bourgeoisie will never do.

Must Europe then travel the bitter road to enslavement and stagnation to the bitter end? I do not know the answer. But of this I feel sure: if Europe is to be saved from total colonization, it will have to be by the European proletariat which can dare to oppose the domination of American capital because it has no stake in the preservation of capitalism. Quite the contrary.

If I am right, European radicals need to do much new thinking and to devise new strategies and policies. It is true that revolution is not on the agenda in your countries (or in mine) now or in the foreseeable future. But the struggle against American domination *is* on the agenda— here and now. And by taking up this struggle, the European proletariat can once again assume a crucial historical role, can emerge from the political isolation and frustration which I sense have weighed upon its spirit in these years of relative capitalist prosperity.

I have often heard it said in recent years that the European working class ought to oppose America's global policies out of a feeling of international solidarity with the victims of those policies in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. That is true. But it is not enough. The European workers ought to struggle against American policies—and above all against the penetration of American capital into their own countries—because in a historically very short period of time Europe's proletariat is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threatened with the same fate as the colonized masses are already suffering under—and courageously revolting against.

The best way the European working class can help the struggle of the "wretched of the earth" is to help itself. And that means to fight against American capitalist penetration, which in turn means to fight to weaken world capitalism. The necessary corollary, I believe, is to fight *for,* openly and proudly, the socialist revolution which alone can save the world from the tortures to which it is now being subjected and will increasingly be subjected as long as capitalism and imperialism survive.

JUDGES' STATEMENT

The works which this year aroused most interest were those of the two American scholars, Paul M. Sweezy and Leo Huberman, who for 17 years have edited the most penetrating and militant publication of the American Left, MONTHLY REVIEW. . . .

The fundamental genius of these two writers lies in a Marxist humanism. . . . In the world's struggle against capitalism and imperialism, there has been neither an argument nor an event which has not found in the works of Huberman and Sweezy an interpretation of high intellectual caliber and painstaking lucidity. We find it particularly encouraging that they are living proof of the existence of "another face to America."

Recognizing the joint work of two brilliant and resolute scholars like Paul M. Sweezy and Leo Huberman as an integral part of the present struggle for the affirmation of the ideals of the Resistance, the judges have unanimously agreed to grant to them, and to those whom they represent, the Seventh Award "Città di Omegna."

Is Socialism a dream?

It is no dream, but a cause; men and women have died for it, not in ancient times, but in our own time; they lie in prison for it, work in mines, are exiled, are ruined for it; believe me, when such things are suffered for dreams, the dreams come true at last.

—*William Morris*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Mao's Great Leap

During our travels in Europe and Asia in the past four months, dozens of worried socialists and communists, in private and in public, have asked the question: "What is happening in China?" No current situation, except perhaps the war in Vietnam, has aroused so much interest on the Left or occasioned so much concern.

Mao Tse-tung has been fighting against capitalism and imperialism for half a century. Before October 1, 1949 (when the Chinese Peoples Republic was proclaimed), he struggled to liberate the Chinese people from domestic exploitation and foreign domination. In the course of the struggle the Liberation Armies established themselves as the champions of a new and better way of life for the Chinese people.

The exact nature of the new life was spelled out in the 1953 Constitution which declared that gradually, step by step, the Chinese people intended to replace the remnants of feudalism and capitalism, first with socialism and later with communism. To secure these results a program of planned industrialization was launched, together with a series of reforms in the countryside that brought the 500 million peasants through land reform and collectivization into the communes that were established during 1958.

From 1949 until 1958 Mao Tse-tung master-minded a government devoted to building socialism in the most populous country on earth. The outstanding unity and stability of the Peking government, from 1949 to 1958, its economic, political, and cultural achievements spread Mao's name and fame across the planet.

Toward the end of this triumphal decade of socialist construction the Peking government made two dramatic moves. It converted 275,000 collective farms into 24,000 communes. In the same year (1958) it undertook a Great Leap Forward in agricultural and industrial production, as advances made be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween 1949 and 1957 were not rapid enough to satisfy Mao's idea of speedily banishing China's backwardness.

Inside the Communist Party there was disagreement on the Great Leap. Many leaders said: "Already people are doing their utmost. Why push them harder?" Unconvinced, Mao insisted on the program, and as 1958 drew to a close with widespread reports of plan-fulfilment in all fields, he proclaimed: "We have made a Great Leap in 1958; from there we will go on and make an even greater leap in 1959."

Alas for the "plans of men." Instead of a forward leap in 1959, China's economy was pushed backward by natural disasters that extended through three years, into 1960. Part of the setback was undoubtedly due to the relaxation and rest that men require after any supreme effort. For the next seven years Chairman Mao was a venerated symbol, but leadership of China's revolution was in other hands.

Red Guards As Mass Support

Mao Tse-tung bided his time and laid his plans to take back control of the Chinese Revolution into his own hands.

The Communist Party apparatus, the immense trade union network, and the administrations of national, provincial, and municipal governments seem to have been split and were largely in the hands of Mao's critics. Faced by this formidable obstacle, Mao worked out a plan for gaining the mass support he needed to regain control of the Chinese Revolution. In alliance with the Army head, Lin Piao, Mao took two drastic steps. He built up his own personality cult by a much advertised long swim in the Yangtse River, which refuted tales of his illness or death. He also had his writings promoted, his picture distributed, and his sayings repeated, building himself up as sole teacher, leader, prophet, and inspirer of the Chinese people. At the same time China's high schools and colleges were closed for a year. This move placed at Mao's disposal several million teenagers. He urged these unemployed youngsters to move about, exchanging revolutionary experiences and learning the ways and geography of their country. To facilitate the process, free transportation and free food were provided. Millions of young people converged

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on Peking to see Chairman Mao; then they fanned out to implement the Cultural Revolution.

Under the slogan of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, Mao urged the teenagers to root out feudal remnants, bourgeois ideas, bureaucrats, enemies of the people, and opponents of his program. Where necessary, radio stations, publishing houses, and administrative offices were to be occupied and manned by supporters of the Cultural Revolution. Where real opposition was encountered, the teenagers were to be backed up by army detachments, brought increasingly under Mao's personal control.

This process was labeled "revolution from the bottom" or "people's democracy." In reality it was a seizure of power led by a minority at the top.

Pro-Mao and Anti-Mao

Proletarian Cultural Revolution *now* and the *coup d'état* necessary to promote it, were to be gifts of Mao's thought and Mao's genius to the people of China and of the world. Mao planned it, organized it, directed it.

Mao had been the titular leader of the strong team which guided China's destinies through the critical years from 1949 to 1957. After the Great Leap in 1958 the team split up. The Cultural Revolution, launched in 1966, was Mao's personal handiwork. At the center of the revolution was Mao's thought expressed in his writings. Those who accepted Maoism were for the Cultural Revolution. Those who questioned or opposed were dubbed "counter-revolutionary" or "bourgeois-minded revisionists." Through the fall and winter of 1966-1967 all China was being divided between those who were pro-Mao and those who were anti-Mao.

The turmoil into which China was plunged during the winter of 1966-1967 was the logical result of a vigorous campaign to drive all anti-Mao elements out of public life and replace them with individuals loyal to Mao and willing to promote his Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Two dominant factions developed. One was led by Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the other by President Liu Shao-chi. There were minor factions, under the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direction of regional leaders. There is as yet no reliable information regarding the role played by the Chinese peasantry in the power struggle.

Aside from epithets such as "revisionist," "bourgeois-minded," "visionary," and "counter-revolutionary," there is no evidence that differences of principle separated the contending factions. On the contrary, the split in the Chinese Communist ranks had the earmarks of a typical battle for leadership at the summit of organizational authority.

Division between the pro-Mao and anti-Mao forces spread quickly across the planet through two main channels. First and most apparent was the noisy dispute which began in 1960 between the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties and extended to most Communist Parties throughout the world. In a theoretical sense the dispute concerned the tempo of social change, not the final aim of socialism.

Mao had pushed the social revolution in China at high speed from 1952 to 1957, climaxing in the Great Leap of 1958. His hard driving was based on the assumption that the Chinese masses were waiting for aggressive revolutionary leadership. The spectacular mass response in China during the 1949-1958 decade led Mao to another assumption: that the masses outside China likewise were eagerly waiting for militant revolutionary guidance. On this issue Mao split with the Soviet Communist leadership and ultimately with most of the Communist Parties of the world.

Lenin, at war's end in 1918, assumed that the peoples of Europe were ready and eager to rise against their exploiters, throw off the shackles of imperialism, liberate themselves from bourgeois ideas, and move in a revolutionary torrent from capitalism to socialism. Mao acted on the same assumption 20 years after the Second World War had ground to a shattering halt.

The debate inside China at the time of the Great Leap and between the Communist Parties of the world after 1960 was couched largely in terms of Marxian theory. The concrete issue on which the Communist Parties divided was the existence or non-existence of a revolutionary spirit among the exploited masses, especially in the "have-not" countries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Price of Mao's Cultural Revolution

This explanation of recent Chinese events has been put together out of shreds and patches of information gathered at home and abroad. The entire construction may or may not be faulty. Whatever Mao's intentions, strategy, or tactics, four historical facts emerge from the Chinese rough-and-tumble of the past year, challenging Mao, his assumptions, and his revolutionary procedures.

First. China, unified with so much sacrifice, hardship, and suffering during the 38 years from Sun Yat-sen's coup in 1911 to Mao's victory in 1949, has been divided by Mao's Proletarian Cultural Revolution and brought to the verge of a cold civil war.

Second. After years of bitter, persistent attack directed by Mao and his backers against the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the socialist segment of the planet (stretching from the Baltic and the North Sea through the Soviet Union, southeast Europe, and central Asia, to China) has also been split wide open. This process, surfacing in 1960, has divided countries engaged in socialist construction and the Communist and Workers' Parties of the planet into wrangling factions.

In unity lies the strength of every forward movement. Lenin split the socialist movement in 1919 when the Communist International was organized. Mao has achieved the same result in 1966-1967. Lenin's splitting move was made when socialism was in its administrative infancy. Mao's splitting move was made fifty years later when socialist countries dominated the Eurasian heartland and were rapidly converting Asia into the first socialist continent.

Third. Socialists the world over are confronted by the implacable determination of monopoly capitalism, led by the American oligarchy, to contain, fragment, roll back, and destroy socialism and communism wherever they exist. Four fifths of the human beings living in countries busied with socialist construction are in Asia. Stung by the success of the Castro revolution in Cuba and confronted by the possibility that socialism and not capitalism would fill the power vacuum created by the expulsion of the imperialists from Asian soil, the United States

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oligarchy, with such European and Asian support as it could muster, has launched a full-scale crusade to drive through the breach in the planetary revolutionary forces, crush the divided socialist segments one by one, reconquer and reoccupy Asia, and open up its vast resources and its immense reserves of labor power to capitalist exploitation.

Fourth. Fundamental to all strategy is the principle: in the face of a powerful enemy, never divide forces. Mao's coup has violated this principle by dividing China and dividing the world socialist movement, thus opening the door to the forces of counter-revolutionary imperialism under Washington's aggressive leadership.

It is possible that Mao has designed a Hannibalist enveloping movement that would open an Asian trap to the "paper tiger" of Western imperialism, the intention being, when the tiger is contained, to seal off the exit and crush the imperialist intruder. It seems far more probable that after years of frustration and watching his country turning to "revisionist" ways, Mao decided that he and he alone could save the world revolution. Hence, he felt that his return to the power summit was worth the price of a divided China and a divided world socialist movement. History will determine whether he was on the right track.

Mao Tse-tung, like so many impatient idealists, believes in leaping at once from the present into the future, cutting off all connection with the past, which consists of accumulated economic, political, and social experiences. Insofar as human beings are shaped by their social environment, they are the product of these experiences. Hence, if they wipe out the past, they wipe out their social selves. One of our most noteworthy current experiences is the bourgeois revolution, a process that has extended over several centuries. Can this process be speeded up? Of course. Can it be made instantaneous? Probably not. All processes take time.

Social revolution is a process. In the future, as in the past, it will be a dialectic process, in which revolutionary forces and counter-revolutionary forces will continue to play their opposing role. Social revolutionaries, with all of their ardor and militancy, will not convert a dialectic process into a one way street.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Most of the mail commenting on the Jarrico poem in the March issue was critical of the author and of us. We publish below two of several angry criticisms.—The Editors

A Shameful Thing

The "Carol for J. V. Stalin" by Paul Jarrico in the March MR was a shameful thing to print. Jarrico started "with apologies to Alfred Hayes and Earl Robinson." He should also have apologized to Joe Hill, the American working class, the Russian people, the Chinese people and their leaders, and everybody who fought against fascism and is today fighting for revolution.

The basic point of his parody of the inspirational song about Joe Hill is that Stalin is alive today "Wherever bureaucrats are found." Where is that? "From Peking to the Pentagon/ From Mao to LBJ/Wherever thinking's petrified."

LBJ is the head of state which represents the United States ruling class, the main enemy of the people of the world today. He occupies the position that Hitler, representing German imperialism, held during the Second World War.

Who did Hitler hate more than any other man? Stalin. Who does LBJ most despise? Mao Tse-tung. Both of these men are so dogmatic that they insist on opposing the #1 enemy of the people of the world. They absolutely will not give in, no matter how big the juggernaut. They won't compromise; they fight.

Stalin made mistakes. His mistakes were made in the context of opposing imperialism and its big helper, revisionism (Jarrico—Any "bureaucrats" in Moscow today?). The Chinese Communist Party, led by Mao Tse-tung, has learned from those mistakes and is opposing imperialism and advancing revolution today.

It's Jarrico who is "petrified"—of fighting United States imperialism. It's Jarrico who has "gone on to dogmatize"—to repeat the cheapest cliches of the United States ruling class.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jarrico should leave that to their hired hacks, who at least shy away from ruining good working-class songs.

That cynical "carol" could only disgust anyone who's fighting for revolution. MR should not print such stuff.

Brooklyn, March 20, 1967 Rick Rhoads

Lapse of Taste

In my opinion "A Carol for J. V. Stalin" by Paul Jarrico, in March issue of MR was an entirely uncharacteristic lapse of taste, which should be formally regretted.

I received my initial political indoctrination in certain branches of the Trotskyist movement, and am fairly well aware of the "mistakes, errors, and crimes" of J. V. Stalin. I am sure the affairs of the Soviet Union and the international interests of the struggle of the oppressed might have been conducted better and at less cost under other auspices than Stalin's.

What is equally important, they might also have been worse conducted. The Soviet Union was not overrun; the means of production were not juridically distributed among a new owning class; most important of all, some sort of shield did exist to facilitate the enormous forward movement represented by Cuba and China.

He who calls himself a communist must take, in a sense, the bad with the good. He cannot indulge in the petty bourgeois and rather "protestant" luxury of identifying only with the undeniably progressive facets of the movement and washing his hands of the more sombre and unsatisfactory phases, however valuable their study may be for the avoidance of similar errors in the present and future. That would be pharisaical.

Trotskyism has performed valuable services in preserving a portion of the heritage of Lenin and the Great October Revolution that might otherwise have lapsed, at least for a long while. It has also, inevitably, its negative side, sometimes sinking to a misleading stridency and an inappropriate vindictiveness. MR should continue its valuable espousal of what is constructive in this tendency. It must likewise guard against contamination by the dross.

Isaac Deutscher's appraisal in *Stalin, a Political Biography,*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certainly not motivated by "softness" toward Stalin, seems to me to offer a valuable model in treatment of this figure. Judged by this standard Mr. Jarrico's poem must be evaluated as careless, flippant, and misleading.

South Kortright, N. Y., March 22, 1967 Stephen D. Jacoby

MR PRESS **Classics of Radical Thought**

THE LABOR SPY RACKET

by Leo Huberman

A revealing study of industry-sponsored espionage, based on disclosures of the famous LaFollette Senate Investigating Committee in the 1930's. An additional chapter brings the story up to 1958.

One of the earliest mass paperbacks, the book was first published by Modern Age Books in 1937, with an initial printing of 125,000 and later in a cloth edition.

Here's what the critics in the United States said:

"Mr. Huberman is notably successful at simplification, a much nobler and very different art from that of popularizing. This seems to be a technique compounded of logical arrangement, simple words, and almost invariable use of the specific fact as against generality. His material was wealthy and chaotic and he whipped it into small, neat shape."—*Saturday Review of Literature*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Mr. Huberman writes for the masses with a pen that has already brought him national prominence . . . Testimony and documents condensed brilliantly and vividly presented . . . fascinating volume."—*Science and Society*

"For a book on labor to sell 50,000 copies in two weeks is a phenomenon. *The Labor Spy Racket* by Leo Huberman, author of *We, The People* and *Man's Worldly Goods* made this grade . . . Mr. Huberman's style is excellent . . . he does not write down, and he makes his points neatly and with humor."

—*New York Herald Tribune*

"A record more startling and sensational than any melodramatic thriller. Leo Huberman has told the story with simplicity, lucidity and vigor."—*New Republic*

And the critics in England said:

"He has so organized and presented his material that it is as exciting and compelling as a fast-moving detective story."

—*Left Review*

"Mr. Huberman's book is of great value."—*The Spectator*

"It is not a book to read reviews of; you've got to read it for yourself to believe it. They are the sort of facts that make people revolutionary whether they've ever heard of Marx or not."

—*New Statesman and Nation*

Price on publication June 30:	$5.00	36s.
Prepublication price:	$4.00	28s.
Associates price:	$2.50	18s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable.)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

or

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHERE WE STAND

BY THE EDITORS

During the early years of the 20th century the subject of socialism was widely and eagerly discussed in the United States. Eugene V. Debs, socialist candidate for president, polled close to 1,000,000 votes in 1912—the equivalent of approximately 3,000,000 votes in the 1948 election. The popular interest in socialism was reflected in an enormous sale of socialist literature. *The Appeal to Reason,* a weekly, had a circulation of more than 300,000 for several years; pamphlets by Oscar Ameringer were printed in editions of hundreds of thousands; books by Bellamy, Upton Sinclair, and Jack London ranked with the best-sellers of the day.

This widespread interest in socialism has declined to such an extent that today it would probably not be an exaggeration to say that for the great majority of Americans "socialism" is little more than a dirty word. This is an extraordinary situation because it occurs at the very moment that a large proportion of the rest of the world is moving toward socialism at an unprecedentedly rapid rate. It is a deeply disturbing situation because there are still many Americans who believe with us that, in the long run, socialism will prove to be the only solution to the increasingly serious economic and social problems that face the United States.

It is because we hold firmly to this belief that we are founding MONTHLY REVIEW, an independent magazine devoted to analyzing, from a socialist point of view, the most significant trends in domestic and foreign affairs.

By "socialism" we mean a system of society with two fundamental characteristics: first, public ownership of the decisive sectors of the economy, and second, comprehensive planning of production for the benefit of the producers themselves. The possibility and workability of such a system of society

---

Reprinted from Vol. I, No. 1 (May, 1949).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are no longer open to doubt. Socialism became a reality with the introduction of the First Five Year Plan in Soviet Russia in 1928; its power to survive was demonstrated by the subsequent economic achievements of the USSR during the '30s, and finally, once and for all, in the war against Nazi Germany. These facts —and they are facts which no amount of wishful thinking can conjure away—give to the USSR a unique importance in the development of socialism and in the history of our time.

We find completely unrealistic the view of those who call themselves socialists, yet imagine that socialism can be built on an international scale by fighting it where it already exists. This is the road to war, not to socialism. On the other hand, we do not accept the view that the USSR is above criticism simply because it is socialist. We believe in, and shall be guided by, the principle that the cause of socialism has everything to gain and nothing to lose from a full and frank discussion of shortcomings, as well as accomplishments, of socialist countries and socialist parties everywhere.

We shall follow the development of socialism all over the world, but we want to emphasize that our major concern is less with socialism abroad than with socialism at home. We are convinced that the sooner the United States is transformed from a capitalist to a socialist society, the better it will be, not only for Americans, but for all mankind.

We believe that there are already many Americans who share this attitude with us and that their number will steadily increase. We ask for their financial support, their assistance in extending our circulation, and their advice as to how MONTHLY REVIEW can best serve the cause of socialism in the United States.

Clarity about the aims and problems of socialism is of greatest significance in our age of transition. Since, under present circumstances, free and unhindered discussion of these problems has come under a powerful taboo, I consider the founding of this magazine to be an important public service.

—ALBERT EINSTEIN
in his article "Why Socialism?" in Vol. I, No. 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS IN PRINT

		List Price	Price With Sub*
ECONOMICS			
The Political Economy Of Growth—Baran		$ 5.00	$ 9.00
Lands Alive—Dumont		6.75	10.50
Capitalism Yesterday and Today—Dobb	paper	1.00	7.00
The Accumulation Of Capital—Luxemburg	cloth	7.50	11.00
	paper	3.95	8.50
Monopoly Capital—Baran and Sweezy		8.75	13.00
The Theory Of Capitalist Development—Sweezy		6.00	10.00
PHILOSOPHY			
Marxism and Moral Concepts—Ash		3.50	8.00
Pride Of State—Morray		4.00	8.50
Consciencism—Nkrumah		3.50	8.00
The Alienation Of Modern Man—Pappenheim	paper	2.45	7.50
A Philosophy Of Man—Schaff		3.25	8.00
SOCIOLOGY			
Merrie England—Blatchford		5.00	9.00
The American Revolution—Boggs	paper	1.00	7.00
Caste, Class, And Race—Cox		7.50	11.00
A New World in the Making—Dolci		7.50	11.00
Waste—Dolci		6.75	10.50
Studies in a Dying Colonialism—Fanon		4.95	9.00
News From Nowhere—Morris		5.00	9.00
SOCIALIST THEORY			
The Communist Manifesto—Marx and Engels		2.50	7.50
In Place Of Fear—Bevan		4.50	9.00
Materialistic Conception of History—Labriola		5.00	9.00
Marxism Of Our Time—Martinet		3.25	8.00
Parliamentary Socialism—Miliband	paper	3.45	8.00
The Socialist Register, 1964 Miliband and Saville, eds.	cloth	6.00	10.00
The Socialist Register, 1965	cloth	6.00	10.00
	paper	3.45	8.00
The Socialist Register, 1966	cloth	6.00	10.00
	paper	3.45	8.00
Three Tactics: The Background In Marx—Moore		2.25	7.00
HISTORY			
The Menace Of The Miracle—Abosch		5.00	9.00
Capitalism As A System—Cox		6.50	10.50
Man's Worldly Goods—Huberman	paper	2.95	7.50
We, The People—Huberman		5.00	9.00
From Yalta To Disarmament—Morray		8.50	12.00
Revolution In Seattle—O'Connor		5.00	9.00
The Present As History—Sweezy	paper	2.95	7.50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

		List Price	Price With Sub*
BIOGRAPHY			
William Morris: The Man And The Myth—Arnot		3.25	8.00
View From The West—Cockburn		3.75	8.50
Paul A. Baran: A Collective Portrait—Sweezy and Huberman, eds.		3.50	8.00
WORLD AFFAIRS			
Burning Conscience—Eatherly and Anders		4.00	8.50
Ghana: The End Of An Illusion—Fitch and Oppenheimer	cloth	3.50	8.00
	paper	1.50	7.00
Guerrilla Warfare—Guevara		3.50	8.00
Mau Mau From Within—Barnett and Njama		10.00	14.00
The Empire Of Oil—O'Connor		5.00	9.00
World Crisis In Oil—O'Connor	cloth	7.50	11.00
	paper	3.95	8.50
LATIN AMERICA			
Explosion Over Latin America (The Man At The Door With The Gun)—Belfrage	paper	2.75	7.50
The Man At The Door With The Gun—Belfrage		4.50	9.00
Capitalism And Underdevelopment In Latin America—Frank		7.50	11.00
Dollar Diplomacy—Freeman and Nearing		6.50	10.50
Whither Latin America?—Fuentes and others	cloth	3.00	7.50
	paper	1.75	7.00
Puerto Rico: Freedom And Power In The Caribbean—Lewis		10.00	14.00
The Ordeal Of British Guiana—Reno	cloth	3.25	8.00
	magazine	1.00	7.00
CUBA			
Inside The Cuban Revolution—Gilly		2.50	7.50
Cuba: Anatomy Of A Revolution—Huberman and Sweezy	paper	1.75	7.00
The Second Revolution In Cuba—Morray		3.25	8.00
The United States, Cuba, And Castro—Williams		3.25	8.00
CHINA			
China Triumphs—Alvarez del Vayo		5.00	9.00
The Timely Rain: Travels in New Tibet—Gelder		8.95	13.00
Fanshen—William Hinton		12.50	16.00
Notes From China—Robinson	paper	.75	6.75
The Great Road—Smedley		6.75	10.50
NOVEL			
The Road to Spain—Morris		4.95	9.00
POETRY			
Report To The Stockholders—Beecher		3.00	7.50
THE ARTS			
Review I—edited by Frances Kelly	cloth	3.00	7.50
	paper	1.00	7.00

(*All foreign subs, add $1 to price quoted. Prices in pounds sterling can be obtained from our London office.)

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A GIFT TO MR READERS

MONTHLY REVIEW has received a gift of 100 copies of *Foundations of Capitalism* and 100 copies of *Capitalism and American Leadership*, both written by Dr. Oliver C. Cox, professor of sociology, Lincoln University, Missouri. We take pleasure in passing this bonanza on to MR readers.

If You Buy

CASTE, CLASS, & RACE. Winner of the George Washington Carver Award, this book analyzes the background of barriers of social caste, class distinction, and racial friction.
Price $7.50 54s.

You Will Receive—Absolutely FREE

FOUNDATIONS OF CAPITALISM. A description of the origins and development of the social and economic organizations of the capitalist system, this two-part volume deals with the historical processes in which capitalist societies arose and with the factors involved in the rise of the modern nation.
Price $7.50 54s.

•

If You Buy

CAPITALISM AS A SYSTEM. A theoretical analysis of the evolution of capitalism from its earliest beginnings to an international system. In this impressively documented study, Dr. Cox shows that the capitalist system has a definable order and structure which determine and limit the sphere of action open to people, not only according to their status in their own societies but also according to the status of their society in the system as a whole.
Price $6.50 46s.

You Will Receive—Absolutely FREE

CAPITALISM AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP. In the period following the first World War, the United States assumed explicit leadership. Its position and function became increasingly distinct from those of the earlier dominant powers. The work analyzes this development and explores the problems of change and transition in the capitalist system since the first World War.
Price $6.00 42s.

BUY A BOOK GET ONE FREE

Send your order with payment enclosed to:

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

or

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR
PRESS

PAMPHLET SERIES

	English price	U.S. price
Latin America And The Alliance For Progress by Alonso Aguilar	3s.6d.	50¢
The Commitment Of The Intellectual by Paul A. Baran	2s.	25¢
Reflections On The Cuban Revolution by Paul A. Baran	3s.6d.	50¢
Introduction To The Political Economy Of Growth by Paul A Baran	2s.	25¢
The War In Vietnam by Hugh Deane	3s.6d.	50¢
Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	1s.6d.	20¢
Principles Of Communism by Friedrich Engels (trans. by Paul M. Sweezy)	2s.	25¢
Freedom Under Capitalism And Socialism by Leo Huberman	2s.	25¢
The ABC Of Socialism by Huberman and May	3s.6d.	50¢
Socialism Is The Only Answer by Huberman and Sweezy	2s.6d.	35¢
Economic Development, Planning, And International Cooperation by Oskar Lange	3s.6d.	50¢
Economic Aspects of U.S. Imperialism by Harry Magdoff	3s.6d.	50¢
Alienation In American Society by Fritz Pappenheim	3s.6d.	50¢
Marxian Socialism; and Power Elite Or Ruling Class? by Paul M. Sweezy	2s.6d.	35¢
The Split In the Capitalist World And In The Socialist World by Sweezy and Huberman	3s.6d.	50¢
The Theory Of U.S. Foreign Policy by Sweezy and Huberman	2s.6d.	35¢
British Guiana by V. P. Vatuk	3s.6d.	50¢
Total	48s.6d.	$6.75

PAMPHLET PACKET SPECIAL

All the above pamphlets ..... 36s. — $5.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A new, limited edition of

THE PEN AND THE SWORD

By MICHAEL FOOT

In this exciting story, Jonathan Swift, "the prince of journalists," is matched against the Duke of Marlborough, the greatest of English soldiers. The pen and the sword fight a duel. Michael Foot, the author of the book, is a Member of the British Parliament and Managing Director of the weekly *Tribune*.

> "A small slice of history magnified to great advantage . . . Mr. Foot . . . has a special feeling for the clashes that make politics —and books—exciting."
>
> *The New Yorker*

Monthly Review Press is re-issuing this best-seller by popular demand. The earlier edition was quickly sold out, leaving many requests unfilled. Don't miss this second chance. Order now!

Price on publication June 30:	$10.00
Prepublication price:	7.50
Associates price:	5.00

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press, 116 W. 14th St., New York, N. Y. 10011

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

☐ 1 year $6 (foreign $7) 50s. ☐ 2 years $10 (foreign $12) 86s.

Special sub rate to students: $4 (foreign $5) 36s.

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

I enclose $.....

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

I enclose £.....

Please send me MONTHLY REVIEW for ☐ one year
☐ two years

Name .....

Address .....

.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

an 18-year old Tokyo student says: "Your books are so interesting and useful that I keep on reading them till late every night these days. I have become to think as following: There are THE RICH AND THE POOR in the world. Therefore WAR breaks out. We must stand against the war and the fascism, and we must work and study hard for the purpose of Peace and Socialism." The message could hardly be summarized more accurately or briefly.

Speaking of Huberman books reminds us that *The Labor Spy Racket,* a detailed study of one of the most important forms of capitalist class warfare, written thirty years ago, is now back in print in MR's Classics of Radical Thought series. Official publication date is June 30th, at which time the price will be $5 (36 shillings in England). Prior to June 30th you can get it at the prepub price of $4 (28 shillings). And of course if you are an Associate the price at any time to you is $2.50 (18 shillings). Irene Mizrahi, formerly director of the Spanish-language edition of MR (before it had to be moved to Chile because of the military dictatorship in Argentina) recently wrote asking when the new edition of *The Labor Spy Racket* would be ready. "It is a marvelous book," she wrote "very highly educational." Young people in this country should find it so too—and also exciting reading. (For excerpts from the reviews of the book when it first appeared, see pages 56, 57).

In 1962 MR Press published a small American edition of *The Pen and the Sword,* Michael Foot's exciting account of the historic encounter between Jonathan Swift and the Duke of Marlborough. In its review the influential *Library Journal* said: "Here is solid history, more exhilarating than fiction and vastly better written. . . . Eminently purchasable for all collections." The edition was soon sold out, and many orders had to go unfilled. We are therefore happy to be able to announce that the book has been reprinted in England and we have again been able to arrange for an MR Press edition in this country. The price on publication day, June 30, will be $10. If you order before then, the price is $7.50. And again we remind you that Associates can order at any time at half the list price. In this case, we urge those who really want the book to place their orders immediately: a repetition of the quick sell-out of the first printing seems quite likely.

Another MR Press book which is nearing completion is Horace Davis's *Nationalism and Socialism.* For full details about publication date and prices, and the report on the book by Maurice Dobb, the famous British Marxist, see the back cover.

An African student at a European university writes: "Over the past year, I have had an opportunity to subscribe to your publication. Truly it remained my only source of intellectual food for thought and action. As a student interested in the problems of underdevelopment/development I have come to the conclusion that it is only socialism that will save the world. I have therefore throughout the year [1966] saved my extra pennies from my fellowship so that I could become an MR Associate." No message could be more welcome or heart-warming.

From time to time we receive a bequest from a reader who felt, in his lifetime, that financial support would help make possible the continuation of MR as a completely independent magazine. Anyone wishing to follow this example should be careful to state precisely, in his will, that the bequest is to "Monthly Review, Inc., of 116 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS *announces the publication, on July 26, of*

NATIONALISM AND SOCIALISM

by HORACE DAVIS

"Davis's historical study of the idea of nationality in Marxist thought going back as it does to the early writings of Marx, strikes me as both important and interesting. Of especial interest to me were the author's treatment of Lassalle and Bakunin and their disagreements with Marx and Engels as well as of the various strands in the viewpoint of Marx and Engels themselves. All this Davis treats freshly, and his penetrating treatment manages to throw new light. The book is definitely a valuable and provocative contribution to Marxist thought and discussion on a too-little known aspect of socialist tradition: a work that is both illuminating and erudite."—MAURICE DOBB

Price on publication:	$7.50	54s.
Prepublication price:	$6.00	42s.
Associates price:	$3.75	27s.

(In New York City and New York State please add local sales tax when applicable.)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

or

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED